DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 091 24 SO 000 938

AUTHOR	Altbach, Philip G.
TITLE	The Student Internationals. An Analysis of International and Regional Student Organizations. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Wisconsin Univ., Madison. Dept. of Educational Policy Studies.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-8-E-146
PUB DATE	Oct 70
GRANT	OEG-5-70-0006(010)
NOTE	124p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Activism, Cocurricular Activities, College Students, Foreign Relations, *International Organizations, Political Attitudes, *Political Power, Social Change, *Student Organizations, *World Affairs
IDENTIFIERS	*United States

ABSTRACT

The work is a report of a historical study of several international student organizations in their political and educational contexts to learn whether they, in fact, constitute a real student movement on a world scale. After tracing the growth of such organizations as the International Union of Students and the International Student Conference and analyzing the current activities of these groups, the author concluded that no student movement had emerged. Instead the groups often spent time and efforts on issues of the Cold War from either the Russian or the American perspective. Some cooperation was found on an informal scale through such things as conferences and publications, but the major focus of most groups was toward some national view of the world politics and affairs. A special chapter is devoted to the student organizations in the United States. A bibliography is appended. (CWB)

BR 8-E-146
PA 24

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED048091

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 8-E-146
Grant No. OEG-5-70-0006(010)

THE STUDENT INTERNATIONALS

An Analysis of International and Regional Student Organizations

Philip G. Altbach
Department of Educational Policy Studies
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

October, 1970

5Ø 000 938

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION,
AND WELFARE

Office of Education

Bureau of Research

Final Report
Project No. 8-E-146
Grant No. OEG-5-70-0006(010)

THE STUDENT INTERNATIONALS
An Analysis of International and Regional Student Organizations

Philip G. Altbach

University of Wisconsin

Madison, Wisconsin

October, 1970

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgement in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. Department of Health,
Education and Welfare

Office of Education

Bureau of Research

Contents

Summary iv

Introduction 1

Historical Antecedents 5

International Student Cooperation: The Establishment of the International Union of Students . . . 15

The Division of the International Student Movement . 27

International Student Activities in the Cold War: IUS and ISC 32

Political Conflict and the Student Internationals . . 50

i) The Financial Equation 51

ii) Organizational Development and the Cold War . . . 56

Festivals and Forums: Bread and Circuses for the Students . . 74

The IUS and the ISC: An Evaluation . . . 79

The "Other" International Student Groups . . . 83

The United States and the Student Internationals . . 98

Conclusion 103

Footnotes 107

Bibliography 113

SUMMARY

This essay is a study of international and regional student organizations in their political and educational context. While the importance of student activism for both institutions of higher education and for governments is clear, there has been little attention given to the international contacts and cooperation among student groups. This essay, using an historical approach, provides a description of several international student organizations and provides an analysis of their role and effectiveness.

It is the thesis of this analysis that no international student movement emerged from the various student organizations that functioned. The student internationals were unable to make themselves relevant to the needs of activist student movements or even to the national student unions which they primarily served. The student internationals were linked directly to the politics of the Cold War through their financial subsidies and control by the United States or the Soviet Union. Their own operations were tied directly to their source of financing, and much of their energies were spent in struggling with opposing international student organizations. The two major organizations which were linked primarily to the Cold War were the International Union of Students (IUS), founded in 1947 and headquartered in Prague, Czechoslovakia, and the International Student Conference (ISC), founded in 1950 and headquartered in Leiden, Netherlands. The former group is financed by the Soviet Union while the latter, until its demise in 1968, was financed by the United States.

The political orientation of the student internationals did not completely destroy them. A number of services were provided by the IUS and the ISC. International and regional meetings brought students from many countries together for discussions on a range of topics. Publications printed in many languages provided a means of communication among student leaders. although many of these publications were not very relevant to the needs of national student unions. Sports, cultural, and technical organizations were spawned by the student internationals and were reasonably successful in a non-political context.

The IUS and ISC were not the only international student organizations. International groups representing more specialized interests--religious, political, and social--are also active. Among the oldest of these groups is the World Student Christian

Federation and the World Alliance of YMCAs. Political groups such as the International Union of Socialist Youth and the International Union of Young Christian Democrats have periodic meetings. Religious agencies such as the Pax Romana (a Roman Catholic international student federation), and the World Union of Jewish Students are also active. These groups engage in programs of international coordination and cooperation.

The student internationals are now in a state of flux. It is clear that they do not serve the militant student movements which have played such an important role in many countries in recent years. The links of the ISC to the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency which were exposed in 1967 caused that organization to disband a year later. The IUS, which is still under firm Soviet control, has had difficulty in adjusting to changes in international student life as well. Thus, it is clear that while the student internationals have failed to create a viable international student movement, they have provided some services to students. The internationals are now in serious trouble, and it is unlikely that the remaining group, the IUS, will be able to establish itself as an effective organization. It is more likely that the activist groups in various countries will maintain a more informal coordination.

The Student Internationals[1]

Philip G. Altbach

Introduction

Militant student activism has become a major element in political upheaval in many nations and a concern to educators and government officials throughout the world. Governments have been overthrown in such countries as South Korea, Turkey, Indonesia, and Ecuador by students, while the political stability of France and Japan have been threatened by student-led and organized demonstrations.[2] University-based movements have spurred liberalization in Eastern European socialist countries and have been important in the United States. Militant students have expressed an interest in international student activism as well, and such events as the Berkeley student revolt, the French 'events' of 1968, and the struggles of the Zengakuren in Japan have been studied by activists in other countries.[3]

While much attention has been given to student movements and organization in particular countries, almost none has been devoted to the international aspects of student activism. This essay is concerned with the international student organizations and with their role in student movements throughout the world. Two groups, the International Union of Students (IUS) and the International Student Conference (ISC), are the focus of this analysis since they have been the most important international student organizations in the post-war period. Some attention is also paid to other international groups--religious, social, and political--which have had some impact on national student organizations and/or movements.

There has been no international student "movement" in the sense of a successful organized effort involving large numbers of students working for a particular goal, although some analysts have spoken of such a movement. There have been a series of organizations, some dating from the 19th century such as the international YMCA, which have attempted to coordinate, control, and/or serve students in various countries. Some have been concerned with social service or religious activities and coordination, while others have been political or quasi-political in nature. A few of the international student organizations have been formed by student initiative, although most have represented the interests of adults in international student affairs. Some have been financially self supporting but most have been dependent on adult sponsorship.

For purposes of this essay, the student internationals are defined as that complex of international or regional organizations which are or have been concerned primarily with students. There has been no international student movement emanating out of these internationals and most of the groups under discussion have, in fact, been far removed from any national popular struggles or ongoing movements. International youth organizations are, in general, excluded from this analysis, although there has been some interrelationship between international groups serving young workers, farmers, and other youth and the student internationals. Such organizations as the World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY)[4] and the World Assembly of Youth (WAY) have from time to time been involved in student activities, but this has not been their major focus.

This essay is in part concerned with the failure of the IUS and ISC to build a viable movement and to effectively coordinate student affairs. The aims of both student internationals, and more particularly of their adult funding agencies, was to exercise such influence and, in this regard, both have failed. But the two major student internationals and other international groups as well have engaged in a range of educational and political activities, some of which reached students in many parts of the world. Student publications were distributed to thousands of students around the world and focused reader attention on international issues. Regional and international conferences brought student leaders, mostly from national unions of students and not from the more militant activist groups, together for discussions. Information concerning the tactics and issues of student activism has been disseminated through meetings and publications.

Student leaders, particularly from the developing areas, received training in parliamentary procedures and in public speaking at meetings held by the internationals. It is, of course, difficult to quantify the impact or 'success' of the student internationals, particularly without a careful study of their alumni. Yet, there is little doubt that some student leaders were influenced by the movement, and it is certainly the case that a number of those active in ISC and IUS affairs achieved positions of influence in their own countries. It is also probably true that the non-political organizations, such as the Pax Romana (a Roman Catholic international student group), the World Student Christian Federation (Protestant), World University Service (a group which provides financial and other assistance to students in developing areas) have contributed as much to the international student community as the more broadly political organizations. The missions of these latter groups have been more circumscribed and there has generally been more of a common viewpoint held by the affiliated members.

Most international student organizations have not been "membership" groups but rather confederations of other national and/or regional organizations. This has further isolated them from student activism in various countries and has made meaningful communications and influence difficult. Furthermore, the student internationals have traditionally been quite top-heavy--there has been little participation from the affiliated unions and groups and most decision making has been centralized. This has meant that the groups have been further removed from events on the campus and in society.

Perhaps the paramount reason why the student internationals have had little relevance to or authority over national student movements is that students themselves have had limited control over either the ISC or the IUS. Both, in large part, were controlled from without. A key reason for this outside control was the financial necessity of securing outside support for operations. Individual students or student groups have been unable to support a full scale international organization. Travel, publications, and communication are all extremely expensive. Thus, almost all international student organizations have had outside financial support from adult organizations, governments, or other agencies such as foundations. This outside support has meant that independent action has been severely curtailed in many instances. Some of the outside support has been open and noncontroversial, such as the World Council of Churches' support for the World Student Christian Federation. Other support has made international headlines and has caused long-term problems for the groups involved, especially the disclosures of the CIA's indirect subvention to the International Student Conference or the massive Soviet funding to the International Union of Students. Both the mechanics and the impact of outside financial aid and control are discussed later in this paper..

This essay is largely a historical description and analysis of the post-war international student organizations, although some attention is given to earlier periods. Primary emphasis has been placed on the International Union of Students and the International Student Conference, and major consideration is given to their political and educational contexts. Sociological and psychological aspects of the international student movement must await later analysis. It is hoped that this essay begins the process of objective analysis of an interesting and peripherially important aspect of the world-wide phenemenon of student activism.

Historical Antecedents

The student internationals are by no means a post-World War II phenomena. Organizations whose specific purposes were to link student groups in different countries existed as early as the 1850's, but political groups were not organized until 1907, when the Socialist Youth International (SYI) was founded. One of the earliest international student-related groups was the World Alliance of YMCA's. This organization linked the various Y movements in the West and actively promoted missionary activity in colonial areas. While not primarily a student organization, the YMCA's recruited missionaries from college campuses in the United States and England, and had active collegiate programs. The World Student Christian Federation (WSCF) was founded in 1896, largely through the initiative of the American John Mott, and was especially active in promoting missionary work. WSCF international conferences brought togethor Protestant students from various European countries and from the United States, and had an impact on campus groups and on organizations such as the YMCAs.[5]

Despite these few groups, international student organizations did not get a firm start until after 1900, and even then "youth" and "students" were not distinctly separated. The first efforts at a union of youth groups in various European countries was due to socialist initiative. From 1886, when the Young Guards were organized in Belgium until the outbreak of World War I, strongly anti-militarist and radical youth organizations were formed in Europe.[6] Most of these were based among working class youth, although some of the leadership came from radical students or ex-students. Groups were organized in Austria in 1894, in Sweden in 1895, in Italy in 1901, in Switzerland in 1900, in south Germany in 1904, and in other countries. In 1907, at the initiative of the South German Young Workers League, an International Bureau was set up and an international conference was held in Stuttgart in 1907. Twenty delegates from ten European countries and from Australia were present, and the major topics of discussion were anti-militarism, economic demands of the Socialist Youth International, and similar questions. Although no firm base was established, a permanent organization was established by the conference which by

1914 claimed 170,000 members in 15 organizations, mostly in Europe.[7]

World War I caused a major crisis in the European socialist movement and greatly weakened the youth organizations. Some of the SYI's affiliates supported the moderate socialist parties and did not take a strong stand against the war despite their previous anti-war position. Many of the European socialist youth groups, however, did take an anti-war stand and experienced both repression by governments and opposition from adult social democratic parties. The more militant anti-war position of the left-wing youth organizations was expressed in a conference held in Bern, Switzerland in 1915. This conference, organized by Willi Munzenberg, a German socialist youth leader who later was involved in the Communist Youth International and in the Comintern, took a strongly radical line and allied itself with left-wing socialist forces in Europe.[8] Due to factional problems and the difficulties of a wartime situation, only 14 delegates from ten countries took part in the conference. The conference decided to set up its own secretariat in Zurich with Munzenberg at its head, despite the opposition of the Socialist International.

The end of the First World War brought substantial change and growth in the youth and student internationals. This was due to two major factors: (1) the Russian revolution and the impact of Marxist revolutionary ideologies in Europe, and (2) the growth of internationalist sentiment accompanying the formation of the League of Nations. At a clandestine meeting in Berlin in 1919, the Young Communist International (YCI) was formed and dedicated itself to a militant line of support for the newly established Soviet regime. The YCI claimed 229,000 members in 1919, and successfully fought moderate socialist elements in a number of Western European countries and took over several socialist youth groups. In addition, Communist youth organizations were founded in several Asian countries at the time. The main thrust of the YCI was directed at working class youth, and little attention was paid to students.

Moderate socialist elements were also active during this period. In February of 1919, a group of French socialist students issued a call for an international socialist students' organization, and invited students to a conference scheduled for December in Geneva. Organizations representing 20,000 students in 18 countries promised support. The conference was to consider the establishment of an International Federation of Socialist and Communist Undergraduates. Since no further reference has been made to this organization in periodical reports, it is likely that it never was firmly established.[9] The Socialist Youth International, still linked to the Socialist International, also continued to function during this period, although the more radical Communists were strong competitors for the allegiance of many national leftist youth groups. By the fourth congress of the Young Communist International, for example, the YCI claimed one million members in sixty national affiliates.

International radical organizations during the 1920's did not pay substantial attention to the student communities in Europe (where most international consciousness was located). Emphasis instead was on recruiting working class youth. It must be remembered that student populations were relatively small at this time and, with the exception of a few countries, most university students were drawn from upper classes. In addition, organized student groups in several countries, including Germany, were apolitical or conservative. The German student union, for example, excluded "foreigners" (including Jews) from membership in the 1920's.

Radical organizations, particularly those influenced by Marxism, have traditionally had an ambivalence toward intellectuals, and by extension, about students as well. Marxist theory postulates that revolutionary potential resides in the proletariat, and in almost every nation both the intellectuals and the student community come from middle or upper class backgrounds. Thus, until relatively recently Marxist movements have not placed great stress on organizing among students, despite the fact that in many countries a significant portion of the leadership of radical political movements came from among students (and from relatively privileged groups in the society.) It is clear that radical international organizations were essentially uninterested in students during the period between the two world wars, thereby leaving the field to other groups. It is also true that European students were not very active politically and in no country did they have any national impact. The international voice of students, therefore, was not of great importance in terms of broader political considerations.

It is not surprising that the main international student organization which emerged during the inter-war years was basically nonpolitical and devoted to campus-related student affairs. This organization was the Confederation Internationale des Etudiants (CIE), which was organized in 1919 and functioned until the Germans destroyed its secretariat in Brussels in 1940. The organization was founded as the Reunion des Etudiantes Allies in Strasbourg in 1919 and was a confederation of student groups from the victorious Allied countries. In 1924, it changed its name to the CIE, so that it could include student groups from non-Allied nations.[10] Most of the participating national student organizations were from Western Europe; several Latin American or Asian organizations did, however, participate from time to time. Forty-two student unions took part in the 1937 CIE conference in Paris, at which time the CIE was recognized as the representative body for the world's students by the League of Nations.

Throughout its history the CIE remained firmly non-political. Indeed, it served as a prototype for an international student organization which was devoted to the concept of "students as such." The CIE stressed its practical services to students. Its travel section provided aid to student groups and individuals, and a sports section started the World University Games and had a seat on the International Olympic Committee. An Intellectual Cooperation Section, located in Geneva, coordinated student films and other activities, and a press secretariat provided international links between student journals in various countries. Finally, a Social Information Section collected data on professions and other information relevant to careers and other student concerns. The CIE provided modest services for its member student unions with the cooperation and support of the League of Nations and its affiliated bodies, but played little role in the student activism of the times. Despite its non-political nature, the CIE was clearly the most important international student organization of the period, and the organizers of the International Union of Students in 1945 looked back to the CIE for some of their impetus.[11]

The CIE was not the only international student organization functioning at the time. The World Student Christian Federation, with headquarters in Geneva, had an active program of coordiaating the programs of various Protestant student groups around the world, and actively promoted missionary activities. As the social, political, and economic crises of the 1930's became serious, the WSCF took more interest in political and social affairs. A relief organization, the International Student Relief, which traced its origins to 1900, was active in providing aid to needy students in post-war Europe. It distributed some two million dollars to students during the 1920's. Pax Romana, founded in 1921, served Roman Catholic students. Mensa Judaica, founded in 1922, was an international organization of European Jewish students which provided a communication link between scattered Jewish student communities. The International Student Federation for the League of Nations, founded in 1924, focused attention on the League of Nations, which had substantial support among university students in many countries. And finally, the International Student Union, founded in 1925, provided a headquarters in Geneva which student organizations and federations could use for coordination and communications. A student journal, Vox Studentium, was published by the ISF from Geneva. It featured articles on student affairs in various countries and tried to create a spirit of internationalism among students.

While the CIE expressed the interests of traditional European student unions, it did represent some political currents among students. As the political crisis of the 1930's approached, more and more students became involved in politics, both of the left and the right. The International Socialist Students' Federation (ISSF) acted as a coordinating agency for Western European socialist student groups and in 1933 welcomed its first American affiliate, the Student League for Industrial Decocracy. Although the active Communist movement placed its greatest emphasis on working class youth, the Communist Youth International had some student support as well.

A number of ad hoc meetings also involved students in political discussions during the late 1920's and 1930's. One of the most important of these was the "Conference Against Imperialism," organized indirectly by the Communist International. This conference involved 174 delegates from 24 countries and set up a League Against Imperialism with Albert Einstein as the honorary chairman. While this meeting was not specifically aimed at youth and students, many of the delegates from colonial areas were young people studying in Europe. Among the delegates were Jawaharlal Nehru and several Indonesian nationalist leaders. Regional student meetings also took place during this period and, in 1932, a Pan American Students' Congress was held in Mexico City which included students from Latin America and the United States.

In 1938, the International Federation of League of Nations Societies called a World Youth Congress to be held in Geneva. The purpose of the congress was to lay the basis for a mass youth organization linked internationally but based in individual countries. The

Congress attracted 500 delegates and 250 observers from almost every country with the exception of Germany, Italy, and Japan. Political differences barred effective cooperation, and Socialist and Catholic youth movements boycotted the meeting. Although no continuing international youth organization emerged from the conference, a series of discussions were held. One observer noted that while League of Nations officials spoke of the autonomy of youth, they actually interfered in the functioning of the Congress.[12] A second World Youth Congress, called largely at the initiative of pro-Communist groups participating in the "united front" of the period, was held in the United States in 1938, As was the case in 1936, much of the discussion was taken up with political disputes reflecting the crisis of fascism in Europe and other international issues. The conference, however, did take strong stands against colonialism and imperialism, and involved a number of delegates from colonial countries who took an active role.[13]

The outbreak of war in Europe basically ended major efforts at international student cooperation on the European continent. The German invasion of Belgium brought the CIE to an end in 1940, and other youth and student groups found it difficult to function. The radical groups generally went underground and functioned as best they could as anti-Nazi groups in their respective countries. Moderate and non-political groups simply went out of existence. The inter-war period, however, had laid a basis for later international student cooperation, although none of the groups which were formed at the time had much of an impact on students in their home universities. The CIE, particularly, was used as a model for later organizing efforts. Radical groups, as has been mentioned, were not especially active among university students, although many students were involved in left-wing youth movements of varying political persuasions.

The focus of effective political activism among students during the 1920's and 1930's was largely in the colonial areas, where students were in the forefront of various nationalist movements. Japanese students were active in resisting the militarization of their country, and students in China and India were involved in radical nationalist movements. African students were less active, although the emerging nationalist movements were sparked by many students and ex-students. These active movements were generally not represented in existing international student and youth organizations at this period. The international groups, particularly the CIE, were European-oriented and dominated by student unions committed primarily to non-political activities. In a number of Western European countries, student unions were controlled by the traditional "corporations" or fraternities, and were conservative if at all involved in politics.[14] In Germany and Italy, student groups actively assisted Nazi and fascist movements, and were not interested in international cooperation. There was, at the time, no major tradition of political activism among European students and political groups, both on and off the campus, were more concerned with broader social and political concerns than with the creation of an effective international student organization.

International Student Cooperation: The Establishment of the International Union of Students

The experience of the Second World War had a profound impact on European student organizations and on the European consciousness in general. Students became convinced that they must become involved in public affairs if another conflagration was to be avoided. Many felt that they had a special responsibility as university students to take part in efforts to prevent a resurgence of fascism. From 1940 until the end of the war, many European universities were closed and higher education on the continent came virtually to a standstill. Students throughout Europe remembered the events of November 17, 1939, when German troops shot nine Czech student leaders in Prague and closed the universities in Czechoslovakia. This event, which was minor in terms of later repression, became a symbol of fascist repression and of resistance to it. Thus, the European student community of 1945 had a profoundly different consciousness than its pre-war counterpart. The establishment of the International Union of Students (IUS) reflected this firm commitment to the unity of European students around the goal of anti-fascism.

Efforts toward the creation of an international youth and students movement began even before the end of the war. In 1942, an international youth conference took place in London at which representatives from 27 Allied nations met to discuss future youth activities. From this meeting and a similar conference in Washington, D.C., emerged a World Youth Council. Earlier, in 1941, a smaller conference of European students, most of whom had fled the Germans, met in London and set up an International Council of Students (ICS). With administrative help from the British National Union of Students, the ICS maintained contact with students in the USSR, China, and other countries, and initiated discussions of post-war student problems and concerns. The ICS continued its work until 1944, at which time it dissolved in order to make way for a wider and more representative organization.

As the war in Europe was drawing to a close, students in England began to plan for a larger international student organization to reflect their post-war aspirations. The British National Union of Students took the major initiative for calling a conference in January, 1945, which was attended by representatives of 13 countries, including the Soviet Union. The meeting reflected the concerns of the International Council of Students. It set up an executive committee of seven, including the United Kingdom, China, the USSR, the United States, France, Canada, and Yugoslavia. This committee was given the responsibility of organizing a more representative conference. While political as well as other differences were evident even at this first meeting, the desire for unity and the perceived need to set up an international student organization outweighed these differences.

The actual planning for the creation of an international student organization was complicated by the fact that the Czech student union also decided to call an international conference for late 1945 in order to create a similar organization. An immediate conflict was solved when the London committee decided to cooperate with the Prague group, and a decision was made to hold a meeting in London in November, 1945, and at that time to urge students to attend the Prague meeting which was to begin a few days later. The London student conference was held in conjunction with the founding congress of the World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY) which also convened in London only a few days before. The spirit of anti-fascism which pervaded in the WFDY conference influenced the student meeting as well, although the strong Communist influence evident in WFDY from the beginning was somewhat absent in the student conference.

The London international student congress took place on November 10 and 11, 1945; about 150 representatives from 38 countries attended. The London meetings made a number of decisions which had major implications for later developments in the student internationals. Despite urging from Communist representatives, it was decided not to affiliate the new student group with the World Federation of Democratic Youth, which was directed toward youth and which already had a strong Communist influence.[15] The spirit of anti-fascism was very strong and many delegates sacrificed their own political views to the goal of student unity and the establishment of a strong new International. The conference agreed that the new organization should be centralized and able to make decisions on matters of importance to the world student community. Fascist groups were to be excluded from membership, but other representative organizations were welcome. The conference disagreed on whether the new student international was to be political; the Soviets stated that political activities were justified, while many of the more traditional and conservative Western European student unions opposed any participation in politics. Discussions on the nature of democracy and on the proper scope of student activities were held, although no consensus was reached on them.

The London student conference lasted only two days, and most of the discussions were quite general. Despite the evident disagreements, the heady air of post-war friendship dominated the meetings and the delegates departed for Prague in a buoyant mood. An International Preparatory Committee was established to work out the details of the new organization, to draft a constitution, and to plan for a founding Congress scheduled for 1946 in Prague.[16]

The Prague meeting was much larger and more impressive than the London conference, although the atmosphere was much the same. Six hundred students from 51 nations attended the congress, which took place from November 17 to 25, 1945. This was the first international meeting to take place in Prague since the war, and the student delegates were welcomed by the population and by the Czech government. The Prague meeting resembled the earlier sessions in London in that no fundamental decisions were made and the task of working out organizational details were left to the International Preparatory Committee. The sessions in Prague were largely massive expressions of student unity and a desire to prevent a resurgence of fascism. It should also be noted that the near majority of more moderate student unions which existed in London was turned into a minority by the influx of a large number of East European Communist student representatives. However, despite a Communist majority the Prague meeting emphasized unity and refrained from taking stands which would split the not yet fully formed organization.

The International Preparatory Committee (IPC) worked out the details of the IUS constitution and other matters during the early months of 1946 and called the first World Student Congress for August 18, 1946 in Prague. A number of observers have noted that a large proportion of the members of the IPC were Communists, thus giving a specific orientation to the basic organizational structure and early decisions of the IUS.[17] The draft constitution of the IUS reflected a strong centralized structure with an emphasis on political participation as well as service to affiliated student organizations. The need for students to strenghten the anti-fascist alliance was also stressed. A number of Western European student unions opposed these political trends and favored a return to the "students as such" position of the pre-war CIE, but they were in a clear minority and did not want to quit.

The Congress which convened in Prague on August 18, 1946 took its tasks seriously. The 300 student delegates from 38 countries and representing around 140 student organizations engaged in long deliberations over the constitution, the orientation of the IUS and other matters. While Communist student groups were in a majority at the congress, they did not press their numerical superiority when substantial opposition was expressed for fear of splitting the organization. The basic accomplishment of the Congress was to ratify the constitution and to approve the establishment of various agencies of the IUS, such as a travel bureau. A lengthy debate over the constitution reflected some of the divisions within the new organization. For example, an American proposal to let member unions decide which IUS decisions to implement and which to ignore lost on a vote of 170 against, 70 for, and 13 abstentions. For the first time, some of the Western European and U.S. unions coordinated their activities, reflecting later developments in the student internationals. Yet, despite some problems and disputes, most Western delegations returned home with favorable reports and with optimism that international student cooperation was possible.

The IUS Congress served as an impetus for student organizations in specific countries. For example, the American delegation, which consisted of 25 people representing such diverse groups as the Communist American Youth for Democracy, the Unitarian Youth, and the Intercollegiate Christian Council returned home with a concern that an American student union had to be formed. Out of this conviction and much hard work, the U.S. National Student Association (USNSA) emerged in 1947. The American delegation to the Prague Congress constituted itself as an organizing committee which prepared the groundwork for the foundation of the USNSA, and succeeded in arousing substantial student support. From the beginning, the USNSA took an active role in international student affairs. The formation of the IUS also stimulated interest in the formation of student unions and in student involvement in international affairs in other countries.

One of the final, but most important actions of the Prague Congress was the selection of an executive committee for the IUS. This executive committee had substantial power and effectively shaped the policies and image of the organization between congresses. From the beginning the executive committee was dominated by Communists, and this insured Communist control over the IUS.[18] The executive committee consisted of 17 members from as many countries.

By early 1947, as the Cold War began to take shape, the International Union of Students was firmly established and began to function as an international organization. Its journal, the World Student News, began publication and various projects were undertaken. The IUS could rightfully claim to be representative of most of the world's student unions. A few of the more conservative Western European unions such as the Dutch, would not affiliate, because they refused to be bound by IUS policies on political matters. The bulk of IUS membership at this time came from European nations, both West and East, although a few unions from the developing countries also participated. As has been noted, the political orientation of the IUS was evident from 1947, although most non-Communist unions felt that it was possible to work with Communist student organizations in the spirit of unity. Indeed, the Communist majority in the organization tried hard in the early period to avoid antagonizing non-Communist student unions and in large part succeeded in this policy.

Several trends are evident which have implications for later developments even in the very early and most united period of the International Union of Students. The infusion of Cold War politics into the student internationals was clear from the outset. Soviet student representatives were, from all available accounts,[19] acting in a disciplined manner and they exercised a strong influence over other Communist delegations. The Soviet Union tried, with substantial success, to assure that the various international organizations, such as the IUS and the WFDY, which were sympathetic to their position aided Soviet foreign policy. One of the key methods for Soviet domination of groups like the IUS was through financial means. Early financial support for the 1946 Congress probably came from the Czech government, and later support from other East European sources. A clear financial breakdown of sources of support is unavailable for this early period, although it is clear that the IUS needed substantial amounts of money to operate its thirty-man secretariat, to publish its journals, and to provide travel funds for its staff. In 1947, the IUS spent around $100,000, two-fifths of which was contributed by the Soviet student organization and one-fifth by the Czechs.[20] Only eight student unions contributed financially to the IUS out of a total of more than sixty members. The impact of Western governments in the international student movement was less clear, although some interest was evident. For example, several young Americans in the military service were sent by the headquarters of General Mark Clark, European commander, to observe an international student conference in Vienna just prior to the 1946 Prague student Congress.[21] As noted, the American delegation to Prague was politically diverse but predominantly liberal. However, this does not mean that the American government took no interest in it.

The Hardening of the International Union of Students

The early period of the International Union of Students coincided with important shifts in Soviet foreign policy and this had major implications for the international student movement. It has already been stated that the Executive Committee of the IUS was firmly in the hands of Communist students. Indeed, after 1947, the Credentials Committee of the IUS, the body which decided on which student groups were to be represented at Congresses and other IUS events, began to discriminate among student groups on the basis of their political views. For example, the fairly representative All-India Students' Congress was excluded in favor of the much smaller and more isolated All-India Students' Federation, a Communist organization. When the Dutch national union of students decided not to join the IUS, a small Dutch student organization was included as the representative of Dutch students. When the U.S. National

Student Association withdrew its representative from Prague and decided not to formally affiliate with the IUS, the Credentials Committee accapted the almost non-existent Committee for International Student Cooperation as the representative of American students.[22]

The basic change in the orientation of the International Union of Students came with the Soviet abandonment of the war-time policy of the United Front with any anti-fascist groups, the basis of Communist policy in the IUS. Instead, around September, 1947, Communist groups throughout the world adopted a different strategy which emphasized that Communist parties and related organizations should take power themselves. Cooperation with non-Communist groups was curtailed or abandoned, and Communist-controlled international organizations took a much more "militant" line. In the long run, this policy had the effect in the International Union of Students of driving out many of the non-Communist student unions and it made it very difficult for the IUS to recruit newly formed unions from the developing areas. The new "two camp" policy implied that the emerging nationalist but non-Communist governments or independence movements in developing areas were to be considered "reactionary" and that student groups from these countries were counter-revolutionary.

Several events reflect this hardening of policy within the International Union of Students and other international youth and students organizations. The WFDY and the IUS sponsored a conference in Calcutta in February, 1948, on the theme of national independence and the role of liberation movements in Southeast Asia. The Conference took a strong anti colonialist line and on several occasions criticized the IUS for its reliance on the moderate policies of its non-Communist

Western members. The Calcutta conference permitted representatives of the international Communist organizations to discuss some of the changes in Soviet policy which were taking place at the time with student leaders from Southeast Asia as well as to provide some unity and means of communication for radical student and youth organizations in the area.[23] It is significant that shortly after the Calcutta conference, Communist groupings in Asia began a series of armed uprisings against non-Communist nationalist governments, such as Nehru's in India and Sukarno's in Indonesia. This policy of armed struggle was unsuccessful in Southeast Asia and by 1953 it was abandoned. This phase was similarly unsuccessful in the student internationals, as it diminished the effectiveness and strength of the IUS without contributing substantially to militant student activism.

The Communist coup in Czechoslovakia in 1948, while having a strong impact on European politics, also had a very strong influence on the International Union of Students. The IUS, whose offices were in Prague and whose officers and secretariat witnessed the coup, including the suppression of at least one student demonstration by Communist-led police, refused to make any statement concerning the events. At least one IUS officer, the American Vice President, William Ellis, resigned his position with a dramatic letter and relations between the IUS and the U.S. National Student Association ended at that time. Other non-Communist unions were dismayed at the official IUS reaction and began to speak of withdrawing. Sweden and Ireland pulled out of the IUS, and, for the first time, continuing communications were established among non-Communist unions.

A final event related to European political developments which had a major impact on the IUS was the expulsion of the Yugoslav national union of students in September 1949. The IUS secretariat had drawn up a list of criticisms against the Yugoslav student organization, and when the Yugoslavs arrived at the Sofia meeting, they were questioned about them. Many of the participating unions protested against the obviously high-handed and unjustified attack on the Yugoslavs, and the British National Union of Students, previously one of the strongest non-Communist supporters of the IUS, withdrew from the meeting. In accordance with the policies of the Soviet Union and the Cominform toward Yugoslavia at the time, the Yugoslavs were expelled from the IUS, but the cost was a further loss of non-Communist unions from the organization.

These events, coupled with an increasingly anti-Western position (as expressed in World Student News and other IUS publications) were indicative of the IUS's new position. The cost to the IUS was substantial. By late 1949, almost all representative Western national unions of students had left the organization. Many of the large student unions from developing areas were replaced with small pro-Communist organizations. In short, what had started as a representative international student organization in 1946 became limited in membership to Eastern Europe and several other countries. Its political viewpoint mirrored almost exactly the foreign policy positions of the Soviet Union.

Yet, at this time the IUS carried on a program of activities and established itself as an organization. A sanitorium sponsored by the IUS was set up in Prague for 100 students suffering from tuberculosis. The IUS assisted World Student Relief, an agency which provided funds to needy students largely in developing areas, with $20,000, and it aided anti-government Greek students during the Greek civil war. International work camps were organized in various Eastern European countries, and the Second World Youth Festival was sponsored in cooperation with the World Federation of Democratic Youth. World Student News began to appear regularly in 1949, and was distributed in four languages. The serious financial difficulties which the IUS encountered in its early days disappeared, as adequate funds became available from Soviet and Czech sources.

Within a period of four years, the IUS established itself as a well organized student international but at the same time was firmly entrenched as an international spokesman for the Communist position on international and student affairs. Council meetings and other IUS events were generally limited to pro-Communist representatives or student groups from developing countries who were subsidized and therefore reluctant to speak out against the IUS leadership. Thus, almost from the earliest period, the IUS became involved in Cold War politics.

It is quite difficult to assess the impact of the first five years of the International Union of Students, as there are no studies to provide any data. It seems clear that the original idea of an international student organization which would represent the anti-Fascist and democratic aspirations of European students and would provide a means of communication and cooperation had great appeal. Differences over the precise political orientation of the new organization were evident from the earliest period, but a will to compromise was evident. The superior organizational capabilities, plus geographical location in Eastern Europe, assured that Communist elements would control the IUS.

But it was only when the IUS leadership followed the new "two camp" policy of the Soviet Union that the IUS became embroiled in serious factional disputes and began to lose its non-Communist members. By 1953, it became evident that the IUS was no longer a rallying point for the world's students, and that many of the student unions in the newly independent developing countries had no effective representation in the student internationals. Thus, the cost of ideological purity was high and had lasting effects on the IUS.

Throughout its early history the impact of the IUS on its affiliated unions was not great. Several national unions received some impetus from the existence of an international organization, especially the U.S. National Student Association. But the European unions which formed the bulk of the membership of the IUS did not change much as a result of their international affiliation. As the IUS began to take a strong interest in the developing areas and provide financial and other assistance to student unions in those countries, its influence was somewhat expanded. But basically, the IUS reflected the politics of the Cold War and while its activities had some impact on the top leadership of some student unions, it had very little effect on the rank and file of students in any country.

The Division of the International Student Movement

The increasingly obvious partisanship of the IUS not only impelled a number of Western European student unions to leave the organization, but led to consultations among those unions which eventually formed a new international student group. While informal communications were maintained among Western European student unions as early as 1946, the first full scale conference of "minority" IUS members took place in

London in December of 1949. The purpose of this meeting was not to form a rival organization, but to discuss common problems. The 17 unions (all European except for Canada, the United States and South Africa) which met agreed on a number of points, including that the IUS placed much too great an emphasis on political questions, that the political analysis was of a partisan nature, that the IUS was increasingly unrepresentative, that the constitution was repeatedly violated, and that minority groups were neglected.[24] Most of the unions present no longer wished to hold membership in the IUS under the above mentioned circumstances, and a number of recommendations for reform of the IUS were made. A proposal was made to establish an "International Student Conference on Practical Activities" (ISCOPA) which would coordinate activities without taking stands on issues. This new group would not be a rival to the IUS, but rather provide a non-political supplement to it. The organization, however, was never firmly established.

The Second IUS Congress, which took place in Prague in August, 1950 convinced non-Communist unions that cooperation with the IUS was no longer possible. The meeting combined a "militant" pro-Soviet political position in keeping with the "two camps" doctrine with an unwillingness of the IUS authorities to make compromises with the remaining non-Communist student unions. Small and unrepresentative groups were accepted as delegates from several countries over the objections of many Western European delegations. Peace was the main theme of the Congress, with much time being taken up with denunciations of American intervention in the Korean conflict.[25] Western delegates which participated in the Congress left even more dissatisfied with the IUS than they had been before.

Partially as a reaction to the Second IUS Congress, the Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish student unions jointly sent out invitations for an international student conference to be held in Stockholm in December, 1950. Twenty-one western national unions of students attended the conference, which was dominated by two major themes: apoliticism and autonomy for national unions of students. The American delegate, Allard Lowenstein, made an impassioned plea for the establishment of an anti-Communist international organization to counter the influence of the IUS, but his position was rejected by a large majority of the conference, which wanted to refrain from politics completely. After lengthy discussions concerning student cooperation, it was decided that the Conference should meet annually as a means of consultation among the members, and that there should be no executive body. Programs would be implemented by asking individual student unions to assume responsibility for such aspects as student travel, relief activities, international student identity cards, refugee programs, etc. The ideal of the pre-war Confederation Internationale d'Etudiants and its non-political service programs was influential among a number of Western European unions.

The year 1950 was a key turning point in student international organizations, since the minority non-Communist national student unions met for the first time and decided to act separately from the IUS. The reaction of the IUS was, not unexpectedly, quite negative and "splitters of unity" were vociferously attacked. The 1950 Stockholm conference, however was not successful in setting up a viable organizational structure although it did lay the groundwork for one and provided a political and ideological basis for cooperation. The International Student Conference (ISC), as the new group was called, met for a second time in early January 1952 to set up an organizational structure which would be effective in implementing programs. The meeting, which took place in Edinburgh with 25 national unions of students in attendance, heard a report on the accomplishments of the new structure. The report was short, since little had been done. The earlier system of leaving activities up to the initiative of individual unions had not worked, and a shortage of funds had greatly impaired any new programs.

The Second International Student Conference in 1952 established a permanent Coordinating Secretariat (COSEC), and can be realistically considered the founding meeting of the ISC. Much of the conference was devoted to laying the groundwork for a permanent international student organization free of the "excesses" which the delegates had found in the IUS. While a large minority of the delegations (notably the southern European unions) favored setting up an organization with strong executive powers, the idea of a weak secretariat with purely administrative functions won out. An administrative secretary was approved (he was later joined by several associate secretaries), and a small annual budget of some $10,000 was drawn up. It was decided to establish the secretariat in the small Dutch university town of Leiden instead of in Paris in part to keep the new organization out of political activity. A Supervision Committee of six members (later expanded to nine), was established to provide a check on the power of the Secretariat.

By August, 1952, the ISC was fully functioning and student internationalism had been formally divided into two hostile organizations. The IUS Council meeting, held in Bucharest in late 1952, attracted only 43 national unions of students (versus 61 which had participated in earlier meetings). Thus, the ISC had an immediate effect on the strength of the IUS, despite the fact that the ISC was at that time without adequate financial resources. Lack of funds meant that student unions which would have liked to participate in ISC affairs, such as those from New Zealand and Egypt, could not attend meetings. Despite the non-political orientation of the ISC, it was immediately seen as a rival to the IUS and, therefore, involved, however indirectly, in the politics of the Cold War. In addition, internal problems were a part of the ISC from the beginning, exemplified perhaps most adequately in the conflict between the "northern" group (the British, Americans, Scandinavians, and several others) who came to dominate the organization and the "southerners" (led by France and Italy) who were more activist and politically oriented. This and other conflicts continued to plague the ISC, although the organization displayed considerably more openness to various viewpoints than did the IUS at this period of development. The ISC's links with the non-political traditions of international student activism can be seen in a statement from the Student, published in 1957:

> The principles which guide the ISC are the same as those of the former CIE--strict apoliticism, cooperation and friendship between all the students of the world, the study of all questions of education, and finally and above all the realization of numerous practical activities to give efficient assistance to all students in widely varying fields like culture, travel, sports, recreation, etc.[26]

After small beginnings, the International Student Conference engaged in ambitious programs; started its own monthly journal, The Student; and functioned as a counterpart to the IUS. It is significant that the financing of the ISC was linked after 1952 to the Foundation for Youth and Student Affairs (FYSA), a New York-based agency which provided between 75 and 90 percent of the ISC's budget for much of its existence.[27] The FYSA was one of the conduits for funds from the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency which were exposed by Ramparts magazine in 1967.[28] Thus, both the ISC and the IUS were, from their respective beginnings, funded by agencies of the Cold War, and it is not surprising that elements of their policies reflected the dictates of Cold War politics.

International Student Activities in the Cold War: IUS and ISC

The relevance of the international student organizations was, in the last analysis, in the services they provided to student groups around the world and in their role in the student communities which they ostensibly served. It is the purpose of this section to set aside the organizational questions and political disputes which were so much a part of both student internationals and examine some of their programs and services. From the available evidence, it seems that the student internationals did not succeed in providing meaningful leadership or direction either to national student unions or to growing student political movements around the world. Many student unions had little respect for the internationals, feeling them to be tools of the Cold War and of little relevance. Others were disenchanted with the continual political infighting in the student internationals, particularly in the period since 1960. At the same time, the international student organizations did have an impact on some students, especially those who went to international meetings or regional conferences. A number of these individuals later became governmental leaders or politicians. Some made careers in international organizations, and some apparently took academic positions.

The basic means of communications and contact among the member organizations of the two student internationals were conferences and meetings of various kinds. Basic policy decisions in both IUS and ISC were made by congresses of representatives of all of the member student unions. The ISC conferences were held every two years regularly during the existence of the organization. IUS Congresses constitutionally should have been held once every three years, but the IUS was less regular in its meetings due to political crises and other problems. Conferences were also expensive. One observer noted that 8th International Student Conference, held in 1958, cost around $119,000 which included various administrative expenses and the very substantial cost of transporting delegates from many countries.[29]

Conference locations varied from year to year, although the IUS strongly favored Eastern European countries for the location of its congresses (all but two of the IUS's nine Congresses were held in Eastern Europe, with the other two being in Ulan Bator, Mongolia, and Baghdad, Iraq). The ISC congress sites were more geographically diverse, ranging from Quebec and Switzerland to Ceylon and New Zealand. These meetings generally lasted the better part of a week, and usually were housed in university settings. The delegates spent most of their time debating resolutions on international affairs and issues related to world student politics. A smaller amount of time was spent on discussing the functioning of the respective organizations, on hearing organizational reports, and in discussing student-related topics such as travel plans and similar "practical" activities. The ISC probably spent more time on non-political subjects than did the IUS. Congresses passed many resolutions, some with long debate and others after cursory discussions. At any given conference, resolutions on the following topics might be typical subjects for discussions: the racial situation in South Africa, student oppression in Paraguay, the university situation in Argentina, nuclear testing, racism in the United States, African student unity, independence for Puerto Rico, and support for the Vietnamese people against U.S. aggression. Both the ISC and the IUS took strong and consistent stands against colonialism and imperialism, although the IUS had a stridently anti-Western tone to many of its statements and never spoke out against Soviet policy, even at the time of the Hungarian uprising or the resumption of nuclear testing by the Soviet Union. The ISC was willing, on occasion, to criticize American or other Western policy, but its statements were often the results of compromises worked out between the more anti-Western "Third World" student unions and those from the advanced nations and, thus, were not as dramatic as those of the IUS.

The leadership groups of both international student organizations attempted to provide strong guidance to the congresses, and they were generally successful. IUS officers were able to dragoon support by means of various kinds of pressure on recalcitrant delegations. ISC officials were generally more subtle--and not so effective--in their efforts to obtain support for resolutions and policies. Particularly in the recent period, both organizations saw splits and violent factional fighting in congress sessions. At the 10th ISC, held in Quebec in 1962, some twenty delegations walked out of the conference in protest against the refusal of the ISC to admit the pro-independence Puerto Rican student union. The walk-out indicated a deeper dissatisfaction of many

Latin American and some European unions--notably France--with the ruling groups within the ISC. Indeed, throughout the latter period of the ISC's existence, perhaps from 1958 onward, the pressure of leftist delegations from the developing countries was felt in conferences. The IUS also had its problems; in particular, it faced a massive attack by the Chinese delegation and its allies after the Sino-Soviet dispute became open in 1961. The Chinese challenged the Soviets and their allies in the IUS leadership from the left, and made many friends among militant delegations from developing areas. The ISC generally allowed more freedom of expression in its meetings, while it was not uncommon for IUS officials to stop the translations of unpleasant speeches or shut off the microphones.

Most student delegations took a philosophic view toward the congresses. They were, in a sense, guests of the leadership of the organization and most did not take the issues under debate very seriously since they made little difference to student life or problems in their home countries. They were given free trips abroad, and used these opportunities to make informal contacts with other student leaders in their region. The exact nature of congress resolutions made little differences, and if loud dissents threatened future participation, many delegations from developing areas thought twice before casting their votes. A good deal of private grumbling about the amounts of time wasted on credentials disputes and debates over minor issues such as a condemnation of the Dutch for their suppression of freedom in West Irian took place, and many delegates followed the debates with less than avid attention.

International and regional meetings, on the other hand, exposed student leaders from many countries to international issues and problems which they did not face at home, and no doubt broadened their outlook. Debates concerning the implications of colonialism, on the meaning of student unity, and similar questions did have relevance to student leaders and were keenly debated. In addition, practice in parliamentary procedures and in public speaking was valuable, particularly for student leaders from developing areas. In many ways, international student meetings were like miniature United Nations sessions, complete with simultaneous translations into several languages, and this provided a heady atmosphere for many of the delegates. National and regional student groups also used international meetings for their own purposes. For example, African student delegates attempted to build regional unity at such meetings, and Indonesians were well known for seeking to convince international student meetings to adopt pro-Indonesian positions.

Although efforts were made to manipulate international student congresses, they did serve to provide some direction to the organizations during the periods between meetings. This is perhaps especially true of the International Student Conference, whose constitution placed greatest stress on the semi-annual conferences. The research arm of the ISC, the Research and Information Commission (RIC), received its mandate from the conference and reported back to the following conference. Program emphases, such as stress on regional conferences, scholarship aid, or other programs was discussed by the conferences and voted on. And the members of the Supervision Committee were elected by the conference. Other aspects of the ISC's functioning were technically subject to conference policy, but, in fact, the secretariat had a good deal of autonomy. The financial report and, in general, the functioning of the secretariat received little careful attention from the conference. The IUS Congresses tended to have less control on the direction of the organization, although members of the executive committee were elected and policy issues were debated. The substantial power of the secretariat over the operation of the Congress-members of the secretariat often represented their countries at the congress as well as representing the secretariat itself--meant that there was less leeway for meaningful dissent or policy making. It is certainly true that in both the IUS and the ISC the secretariat and the organization's bureaucracy had substantial authority over the continuing operation of the organization and over the policies made at various levels.

Regional and "special interest" meetings were an important part of the programs of both the ISC and the IUS and provided another forum for student leaders from various countries to meet and discuss mutual problems. The ISC was especially active in organizing meetings for "special interest" student groups, such as international press conferences, dramatic events, and regional cooperation seminars. Such meetings resulted in serious and generally non-partisan discussions of special problems and issues. The IUS sponsored some "special interest" conferences but was particularly interested in regional meetings devoted to general or political questions.

One of the ISC's most successful continuing conferences was the International Student Press Seminar, at least ten of which were held during the ISC's existence. Such gatherings had drawn up a student press bill of rights and had implemented an international student press card. A student press survey was undertaken by the ISC which resulted in a listing of student newspapers in a large number of countries. The press conferences were, until 1961, limited mostly to European and North American student press representatives, but after the tenth conference included students from developing areas as well. The conference gave encouragement to providing technical assistance to student newspapers from developing areas. Most of the discussions at these conferences centered around practical problems encountered by student newspapers, although resolutions on restrictions on student press freedoms in various countries were also passed. The ISC's interest in the student press was also exemplified by ISC support for an Asian Student Press Bureau (ASPB) in New Delhi which functioned for several years in the early 1960's as a clearing house for Asian student news. The ASPB issued press releases to student newspapers in Asia which included events in various countries as well as some analysis of student-related events. In 1966, the ISC also sponsored an European Student Press Bureau, which had most of the same functions as its Asian counterpart. Due to financial difficulties, it only operated for about a year.

A number of seminars and special events were organized by the ISC. A seminar in racism was held in Uganda with participation of students from eight African nations in 1961; another seminar on the "Role of Students in Independent Asia" was held in Ceylon in 1958; and work camps were organized in Chile in 1961 to aid in earthquake relief. Several such seminars were sponsored during most of the years of the ISC's existence. ISC officials and financial aid also helped to organize national seminars on various subjects such as the seminars in India and Malaysia on the role of national unions of students in national life sponsored in 1961.

The IUS too was active in initiating specialized events or regional conferences. International conferences of students of architecture and of agriculture students were held in 1954 in Italy and Bulgaria, respectively. International chess tournaments were also sponsored by the IUS. A meeting of Arab student leaders in Beirut was sponsored by the IUS in 1967 to discuss Israeli aggression. the IUS also assisted seminars on democratization of education in Columbia, Panama, and Argentina in 1967. Thus, it can be seen that the international student groups carried on similar programs in order to facilitate communications and provide programs for affiliated national unions of students. The IUS emphasis was more political, but both accomplished similar ends. It is likely that perhaps 2,000 student leaders per year were involved in these regional conferences and special interest meetings sponsored by either of the two international student organizations.

In addition to international and regional meetings, the international student movement initiated other activities. Both the ISC and the IUS ran student travel services and coordinated student flights, sea voyages, and the like. In some cases the international groups coordinated events sponsored by individual national unions; in other cases, the international groups directly organized them. The ISC sponsored a number of student travel conferences meant for specialists in the field from national unions engaging in these programs and for professional travel specialists. These travel-related activities did provide European and North American students with inexpensive tours and transportation and were a valuable service to the students involved. Most IUS travel activity was concentrated in the Eastern European countries, while ISC services were mostly in Western Europe. Few students from developing areas were involved in such programs.

Some of the most significant international student activities were in the areas of student sports and drama. International sporting competition among students goes back to the 1920's, when the Confederation Internationale d'Etudiants organized student "olympics". Post-war student sports have been involved with politics, although they have also involved thousands of students in various kinds of athletic events. The major international student sports organization has been the International University Sports Federation (FISU), which was organized by Western European student unions after the IUS became involved in partisan politics. Although the IUS has maintained its own Sports Department, since 1959 the FISU has had participation from both ISC and IUS student unions and has been, in effect, one of the few unified international student agencies. The FISU has organized Universiades, or student olympics, every two years in a variety of locations, such as Brazil, Bulgaria, Japan, France, and Czechoslovakia.[30] Universiades have involved up to 2,000 student athletes from forty countries. Thirty-six countries are now full members of FISU, from the U.S. National Student Association to the Soviet student group and many organizations from the developing countries. The center of interest in international student sports competition, however, remains in Eastern and Western Europe. FISU has become involved in politics on a number of occasions, the most serious being when Communist participants walked out of the Tokyo Universiade in 1967 when the North Korean delegation was not allowed to participate. This reduced the number of participants by about one-half. But the FISU, which has its headquarters in Louvain, Belgium, and holds general assemblies from time to time, has been notably free of disruptive politics and has greatly facilitated an active international sports program among students.

Less active than the FISU, but still important, is the International Student Theater Union (ISTU). The ISTU was founded in 1962 as the successor to the European Student Theater Union, and includes participants from both Western and Eastern Europe. Its membership is open to all university-related amateur theater groups, and currently around 150 theater groups are members, 90 of which are located in Poland. There are four international student theater festivals which are generally held every summer under the auspices of the ISTU--in Parma, Italy; Erlangen, Western Germany; Istanbul, Turkey; and Zagreb, Yugoslavia. The large majority of participants in both the ISTU and its festivals are European theater groups.

One of the key activities of both international student organizations were their press and publications programs. Both had monthly magazines which were aimed at a broad student audience in many countries. Each organization also published a periodical which reported on events in the student world as well as on organizational activities. Pamphlets, posters, and other occasional publications were also issued. Each group has also published various kinds of documents for individual national unions of students several times. The major publishing effort has been, however, the monthly magazine. The largest and oldest magazine, World Student News (WSN) was started by the International Union of Students in 1946, and has appeared continuously since with some short periods of interruption. Printed on glossy paper, WSN has featured articles on a range of student concerns from theater and sports to politics and humor. The dominant tone of the magazine has generally been political, although during several periods politics has been downgraded in favor of more "popular" subjects. World Student News has been publishing in English, French, Spanish, German, Russian, Czech, and perhaps several other languages, and its circulation has been probably more than 50,000. Its cost has been nominal but it has, in general, been distributed free to student unions and student leaders throughout the world.

The Student, the publication of the International Student Conference, was naturally started later than WSN. It began in 1956, and appeared regularly on a monthly basis until 1968. The Student was printed in three main languages--English, French, and Spanish--with some issues also appearing in Arabic. Its circulation was around 25,000, again mostly with free distribution to student unions and leaders. The Student was better edited than its IUS counterpart, and featured many articles concerning university and student problems in specific countries. Both WSN and The Student reflected the political and organizational positions of their sponsoring organizations, and it would seem that neither made a very great impact on student communities in various countries.

International student journals were quite expensive to produce, and it is unclear whether their impact justified their expense. For example, The Student cost around $125,000 per year to produce, and it is likely that the WSN was even more expensive. These journals reached only a tiny minority of the student populations in individual countries. While their articles acquainted readers with international student events and situations in particular countries, they were not of sufficient depth or length to provide much political education or have much impact. Thus, it is unlikely that these journals were taken very seriously by student leaders in many countries.

The IUS's News Service and the ISC's Information Bulletin, also issued in several languages, provided international student news and short items of newsworthy interest to national unions of students.

Names of officers of various national unions of students were printed, as well as announcements of student-related events in various countries. Circulation of these publications was more limited than that of the magazines.

Several specialized journals were sponsored by the International Union of Students particularly. A short-lived journal devoted to student theater was published in English and French by the IUS, and in 1967, a quarterly journal devoted to educational reform entitled Democratic Education was founded. This latter publication featured articles on university reform, statistics concerning higher education, and other analysis. The international student groups were, finally, involved in printing occasional pamphlets on various subjects. The ISC was particularly active in printing pamphlets on many topics. The reports of the Research and Information Commission, which were investigative analyses of student conditions and activities in particular countries, were produced as pamphlets by the ISC and other publications on such topics as colonialism and African education, illiteracy in Latin America, and educational reform in Latin America were issued. Reports of various ISC events, seminars, and conferences were also put out. The IUS had a more limited publication program but did print pamphlets on Vietnam, American education and racism, and other subjects. Both organizations published posters advertising events or concerning political or student related subjects which were distributed widely among student unions.

The publications programs of the international student organizations were impressive in quantity, and many of the pamphlets were of hig quality. Yet, it seems unlikely that the rather substantial sums spent on these programs -- perhaps $500,000 per year for both organizations --

have yielded major results in terms of influencing student affairs or even providing a major educational service. Articles in the monthly magazines tended to be superficial and on subjects of only peripheral interest to rank and file students--thus, they were too detailed for the average student and too general for student leaders. The political positions of both groups were evident in their magazines. The World Student News was especially prone to include political articles which were not only biased, but also repetitive and sometimes insulting to the intelligence of the readers of the magazine. The pamphlet series published by both organizations provided more detailed analyses of particular questions, and thus were more informative.

The international student groups also provided various kinds of technical assistance and gave financial aid to needy student unions, mostly in the developing areas. The IUS began its assistance program by opening a student tuberculosis sanitarium in Prague in 1948, and sponsored another sanitarium in Peking which served Asian students. In the 1950's, IUS assistance was provided to a Students' Health Home in Calcutta which served as an out-patient facility for Calcutta's 150,000 students. In each of these cases, Eastern European student unions also provided various kinds of medical facilities for these new institutions, thereby linking students in the areas concerned with the donor unions. The IUS organized a Student Needs and Welfare Department in 1948 which helped to coordinate various welfare programs and technical assistance projects. The IUS also organized a conference of health experts concerned with students in Prague in 1954 and a conference on tuberculosis in Paris, jointly with the World University Service, a Western relief group, later. The ISC did not take any major interest in the health problems of students.

Both IUS and ISC have given office supplies such as typewriters and mimeograph machines to many student unions, and have donated other materials from time to time. Moreover, the international groups have acted as coordinating agencies for technical aid from student unions in advanced countries. The IUS, particularly, has received office machines from the Czech and Soviet student organizations and transferred them to friendly student groups in developing countries. The ISC stimulated several of its member unions, such as the German National Union of Students, to engage in overseas technical assistance programs in developing countries. These projects were, not surprisingly, linked to the political positions of the international student groups. A good example of this is the fact that the ISC gave substantial aid to the anti-Communist National Council of University Students of India (NCUSI), and ISC member, while the IUS provided similar assistance to its Indian affiliate, the All-India Students' Federation. In other countries as well the student internationals gave aid to those unions which supported their policies. For the most part, a typewriter or mimeograph machine could not substantially alter the direction or the program of a specific national union, but in at least one case, foreign assistance did make a difference in the development of the organization. The Indian NCUSI was never a very popular or highly representative organization and it is clear that it could not have built itself into a recognized national student organization without outside support, in this case from the ISC and from the U.S. National Student Association. Much of the office equipment of the NCUSI was donated from the outside and funds for publishing the NCUSI's newspaper and for issuing the Asian Press Bulletin were provided by outside sources. In addition, funds to aid in several student conferences in India were supplied by foreign sources. The USNSA even supplied a telephone for the NCUSI.[31] While most student unions were not influenced by foreign sources as much as the NCUSI was, even the gift of a typewriter was important for a student union that had little domestic financial resources.

The student internationals also supplied funds for students from most affiliated national unions to participate in international and regional student meetings. Transportation to meetings in distant locations was, in general, too expensive for individual national unions to afford, particularly those in developing areas. In addition, few national unions could have justified the expense even if funds were available. Thus, the international groups provided almost all of the travel expenses for student delegates to their meetings. These travel grants were the subjects of disputes at meetings, and it is clear that they were distributed at least in part on the basis of political considerations. In the cases of a few national unions in developing areas, the incentive of free trips abroad was strong, and made delegates think twice before voting the "wrong" way and risking future travel grants. On at least two occasions international student groups held their congresses in fairly inaccessible places in part to keep out student unions who could not be counted on by not providing them with travel grants. The 9th IUS Congress, in Ulan Bator, Mongolia, and the 11th ISC in Christchurch, New Zealand, are examples of the influence of travel grants. Both meetings were held at a time of tension for each organization and both groups tried to forestall serious opposition in part by the location of the meeting. Despite the political motivations of some of the travel grants of the international organizations, these grants did provide students from many countries with the opportunity to travel which would have otherwise been completely impossible. It should also be noted that many side trips to other countries were arranged in conjunction with IUS and ISC meetings. Eastern European student unions were particularly active in providing free tours for student delegates in order to impress them with the Communist countries.

International student organizations have supplied scholarships for students from developing countries to study in advanced nations. The International Union of Students has given out approximately 55 scholarships per year, almost exclusively for study in Eastern European countries. For the most part, these scholarships were donated by host institutions and administered through the IUS. In 1958, students from Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Nepal, Peru, Sweden, and Uganda participated in IUS sponsored scholarship programs. The ISC also took an active role in providing scholarship aid to students. Its efforts channeled through a semi-autonomous agency called the International Universities Exchange Fund (IUEF), which was financed largely by Scandinavian foundations and organizations. The IUEF not only arranged for interchanges between student leaders from various countries, but also provided scholarships for students forced to flee their countries for political reasons. Refugee students from South Africa, Angola, and Algeria received valuable support from the IUEF. It is likely that the IUEF sponsored fewer than fifty student scholarships each year in addition to its exchange programs.

It is not surprising that the two international student organizations did not work closely together in any of their relief, travel, or scholarship programs. As in the case of most of their other activities, the groups combined their own narrow political purposes with services which were useful to some segments of the student community. The groups did cooperate some times however, and on several occasions, the World University Service did receive some assistance from IUS agencies. It is indicative of the general trend, however, that IUS scholarships and travel grants sent student leaders to the Communist countries while those given by the ISC were intended for use in Western countries. Both organizations served, in part, the same constituency--the student unions of the Third World, and indeed some individual student leaders participated in programs sponsored by the two groups at different times.

It is clear that even in the context of Cold War politics and within highly partisan international student organizations that active programs designed at least in part to serve the world student community were conducted. The most active period for these programs was between 1950 and 1965 for both organizations, with the IUS having something of a headstart on the ISC. While firm financial estimates are unavailable, it seems likely that several million dollars were spent on the various activities sponsored by the two international student organizations. A range of interests were met by sports, theater, educational, and other programs as well as by international and regional conferences on a variety of topics relating to student unions and the internationals themselves were met by these programs and publications. It is true that only a tiny minority of the student communities in any given country had access to the programs and publications of the internationals, and there is no data which suggests that student leaders were fundamentally affected by their experiences. Yet, student union leaders who involved themselves in the international student organizations often showed a high degree of commitment and involvement.

Few of the activist student leaders who have been so important in national affairs in the 1960's had much contact with the student internationals. This fact is one indication of the political irrelevance of student internationals. Indeed, student leaders like Rudi Dutschke, Daniel Cohn-Bendit, Mario Savio, and others had little respect for the international student organizations and little contact with them. Activist student organizations, perhaps with the exception of the Japanese Zengakuren, had little association with the internationals. The KAMI had a political impact in Indonesia while the Indonesian affiliates of the IUS and ISC had none. Even the French UNEF, active from time to time in international student affairs, virtually withdrew from international activities during its period of greatest political activity in 1968. The relationship of the "new left" and the student internationals is considered in more detail later in this essay.

It is difficult to assess the impact and role of the student internationals without a more detailed investigation. While it seems clear that their political influence has been limited, the scope and amount of activities over a period of almost two decades is impressive. It is likely that at least some of the programs and activities of the student internationals had an effect on the individuals involved and perhaps on affiliated student organizations.

Political Conflict and the Student Internationals

The "service" programs carried out by the international student organizations do not obscure the fact that the organizations were (and in the case of the IUS, still is) a part of the Cold War. Their basic raison d'etre in the eyes of those who control them and supply the all-important financial resources has been and still is political. This section briefly describes and analyzes the political realities of the student internationals in terms of their relations with power politics and within the broader political context in which they developed.

A great deal of money was spent on the student internationals during two decades of existence--large sums, that is, in terms of student groups but perhaps small in the context of Cold War propaganda efforts. The nature of this funding and the kinds of controls which were exercised on the student internationals are discussed below. It is somewhat less clear why the major powers--the United States and the Soviet Union--wished to provide funds to the student internationals and what purpose they made of them. It would seem that the Soviet Union placed great emphasis on the public statements and positions of the International Union of Students and the other international organizations under Soviet influence, since a great deal of effort was made to assure that pro-Soviet positions were taken without exception. From the time of Lenin on, some stress has been given to the importance of propaganda work among youth, and by extension students, and this is probably a reason for Soviet interest in international student affairs. Once involved in international student affairs, it was impossible to permit established organizations to deviate from the official "line."

American motivations were perhaps more broadly conceived. It is likely that those in the Central Intelligence Agency and the foundations which supplied the bulk of the ISC's financing were mostly concerned with the maintenance of a non-Communist alternative to the IUS. There was also, in most probability, a recognition of the importance of students as a potential political elite and a desire to influence the student community as much as possible. Both major powers gained some intelligence information concerning student leaders and activities. These comments on the motivations of the adult sponsors of the student internationals are, however, speculative. The fact that the internationals were funded and in part controlled by outside adult agencies is not in question.

i) The Financial Equation

The basis of the outside control of the student internationals was financial. It is a basic fact that no international student organizations has ever been able to finance itself. All student groups which have survived even a short time have had some kind of external financial assistance. For instance, religious student organizations have been and are funded by their respective adult denominations or sponsors; cultural organizations have also received subsidies. Thus, it is not unusual that the political international student organizations were also directly tied to adult sponsors which supplied an overwhelming proportion of their funding. It is estimated that both the IUS and the ISC received almost ninety per cent of their funding from non-student sources. The smaller international student groups, which will receive some attention later in this essay, such as the International

Union of Socialist Youth or the International Union of Young Christian Democrats have also been dependent on adult financing. The fact that there is outside funding and that it is extensive is easily verified by the financial reports of the various groups, despite efforts to obscure the exact financial basis for donations. In addition, when the U.S. government was no longer able to indirectly finance the ISC after the expose of links between the Central Intelligence Agency and the ISC, the organization collapsed.

The financial background of the International Union of Students is less clearly documented than that of the International Student Conference, although it is possible to make a number of generalizations concerning it. It has been 'common knowledge' among those involved in international student politics that the bulk of the IUS's large budget came from the Soviet government or other Eastern European sources. Although reliable figures are unavailable, it is likely that the annual budget of the IUS for its secretariat and various projects comes to approximately one million dollars. One analyst noted that 95 per cent of the IUS budget in 1962 came from membership and other fees paid by East Bloc student unions, with the Soviet Union providing the largest amount.[32] Additional large amounts of money have been allocated for special events such as the various World Youth Festivals, which have been estimated by some sources to have cost more than $25 million each.[33] Detailed financial statements concerning the IUS are unavailable, and discussions of financial matters at Congresses and Executive Council meetings have been cursory and very general. For example, IUS sources claimed that more than $30,000 was collected for the sale of student identity cards and IUS stamps, although only 7,000 cards and 3,000 stamps were sold.[34] IUS officials have been unwilling to answer detailed questions concerning financial aspects of the organization.[35]

At the minimum, since the national student unions of the Eastern Bloc countries are not independent from their governments, it is likely that large donations from them to the IUS, if not coming directly from govermentt coffers, at least have been condoned by the govermments of the student unions involved. It is also impossible that the IUS could be supported by its affiliated student unions--it should be noted that the large majority of the member unions have contributed less than five per cent of the total budget. It seems clear that if large scale financial support from East Bloc countries were not available, the IUS would be unable to conduct an active program. Indeed, it has been noted that when funds were not available, as in 1949, the IUS was hard pressed to engage in any significant activities. It seems also that during the Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia and shortly thereafter the IUS was in some kind of financial crisis, although there were other political considerations involved in this latter case.

It is curious that the links between the International Student Conference and the U.S. government have aroused much more interest and indignation than the well known and long standing financial support by the Soviet Union for the IUS. This was due in part to the fact that the IUS openly took pro-Soviet partisan positions and never bothered to elaborately hide its financial links, while the ISC prided itself on its independence and non-political nature. Yet, it was conclusively discovered in 1967 that there were strong and direct links between the

U.S. Central Intelligence Agency and many international organizations, among them the ISC.[36] The disclosures, which have been conclusively proved, had a major impact on the ISC and led directly to its demise in February 1969. The ISC collapsed for two basic reasons: the main cause was the withdrawal of CIA funding, which had accounted for up to ninety per cent of the ISC's income. Key also to its collapse was the resultant loss of confidence by many national student unions in the ISC. A report prepared for the ISC's Supervision Committee in October 1967 could not conclusively deny links between the ISC and the CIA, and could only state that ISC policy had not been dictated by outside sources. The report also claimed that ISC staff knew that the "dummy" foundations through which funds were channeled were, in fact, conduits for the CIA.[37]

As a good deal is now known concerning the financial relationship between the ISC and the United States government and this example provides a useful case study, therefore, it is discussed in some detail here. The extent of funding of the ISC through "dummy" foundations using CIA funds was very large. It is estimated that between 85 and 90 per cent of the ISC's annual budgets between approximately 1953 and 1967 were contributed through various channels by the U.S. government.[38] In addition, at least one American was on the senior staff of the Coordinating Secretariat of the ISC at all times between 1953 and 1967, and these individuals were without exception former officers or officials of the U.S. National Student Association. Thus, it is very likely that these individuals constituted a link between the American funding agencies and the ISC secretariat. Allegations that ISC officers were "spies" for the CIA in that they submitted reports to the agency on student affairs were also made,[39] and these allegations are at least possible.

The means of CIA funding of ISC programs is a further indication of the relationship between the Cold War and the ISC. Much of the approximately $750,000 budget[40] of the ISC was allocated by its American benefactors not in block grants to the organization but as support for specific projects which had to be approved individually. This meant that the Foundation for Youth and Student Affairs (FYSA), which provided most of the funds for these projects could decide which projects it was to support and which it did not consider in its interest. In a sense, FYSA had a "veto" on ISC activities and, in fact, used this veto on several occasions one of which involved the cancellation of a proposed Latin American seminar. Thus, the relationship between the staff of the ISC and the U.S. government was not simply a matter of funds being allocated for use by the ISC as the ISC wished, but rather involved a much closer relationship with possible ramifications for the day to day functioning of the ISC.

It would be a mistake to dismiss the ISC as a simple tool of the CIA. In fact, it would seem that the ISC exercised substantial independent judgment and its programs were in general self-directed. Most of the non-American members of the Superivsion Committee of the ISC and other of its agencies were probably unaware of the financial connections of the organization, and not very interested in exploring this aspect of the ISC's existence. For its own part, it is likely that the CIA looked at the ISC (and the other groups it funded such as the

International Union of Socialist Youth and the World Assembly of Youth) as a counter-weight against the International Union of Students and, therefore, in the interest of the American government.

This discussion of the financial basis of the student internationals has been presented as a graphic example of the direct and vital ties between the organizations and Cold War politics. Without the Cold War, neither of the student internationals would have been able to function at all, and thus in a sense international politics made the student groups possible. Cold War considerations also prevented the internationals from having a major impact on student movements around the world. Seminar programs and publications were suitable activities, from the viewpoints of the funding agencies, but independent political action was not. Thus, the nature of financial control and the political goals of the donors dictated to some extent both the direction and the content of the programs of the student internationals.

ii) Organizational Development and the Cold War

The early development of both IUS and ISC have been discussed as well as their programs and services to the world student community. In order to further illustrate the relationship between the international student movements and the politics of the Cold War, it is necessary to focus more carefully on the organizational structures and political development of the student internationals. There are important organizational differences in the two international student organizations which are important in understanding them. As has been noted, the IUS has a stronger centralized executive arm than had the ISC. From the beginning, the IUS allowed its secretariat freedom to initiate programs, make political statements, and, in general, guide the organization between its Congresses, which were held once every three years. This power gave the secretariat a very strong position in the organization and made it easier for the leadership--in this case Communist--to effectively impose their views on the IUS.

The ISC was founded out of dissatisfaction with the centralization and politicization of the IUS, and the reaction of the delegates to the first conference in Stockholm in 1950 was to circumscribe any secretariat to the point of impotence.[41] Thus, the Coordinating Secretariat which emerged after the Edinburgh conference in 1952 had few executive powers. It was supposed merely to provide a liaison between the various ISC participating unions and to implement Conference policy, but not to take initiative or to speak out on issues. This tradition of a weak secretariat continued throughout the history of the ISC. It is true, however, that the Coordinating Secretariat became stronger as time went on, in large degree because of its control of the ISC's finances. The New Zealand ISC in 1964 made the final break with the a-political past and gave the Secretariat more power io initiate programs, thus bringing the IUS and the ISC closer together organizationally.

In both internationals, the congress was constitutionally the major policy-making organ which elected the secretariat, made basic policy, and gave direction. But in both, the congresses met infrequently and the complexity of international student politics and increasingly active programs gave more power to the secretariats. In addition, the executive organs of the organizations had a major role in setting congress agendas, inviting delagations, and in providing financial assistance to member unions. Thus, they had a major voice both in the day-to-day operations of the organization and in setting policy.

A word should be said about the growth of the IUS, since as time went on it became a larger, more unwieldy, and in some respects it developed into a more representative organization. Thirty-eight countries were represented at the first IUS Congress in Prague in 1946. At the second Congress, also in Prague, held in 1950, delegates from 72 countries were present. At the sixth Congress, held in 1960 in Baghdad, students from 73 countries attended, although some were observers and not full members. By 1964, 87 national unions of students participated in the congress sessions, and delegates from 80 countries attended the Ulan Bator IUS Congress in 1967. Most IUS Congresses were attended by around 300 students from all continents.

While the IUS Congresses had less power over the setting of organizational policy and direction than constitutionally stipulated, they generally reflected the political trends within the international Communist movement and are, therefore, of some interest. Students from Third World countries often confronted the Soviet leadership with arguments and, of course, the Chinese delegates strongly stated their case. Despite careful planning and the selective granting of travel funds, the serious conflicts that marked international student congresses after 1958 were signs of the divisions within the IUS. Prior to its Peking Congress in 1958, the conflicts within the IUS were not open. However, at the Peking Congress, a Chinese-backed candidate for general secretary came so close to winning that the pro-Soviet incumbent had to agree to stay on in the post. The immediate post-war conflicts in the

IUS resulted in the departure of many non-Communist unions and indirectly to the founding of the International Student Conference. The period from 1950 until 1958 was in general marked by a gradual liberalization of IUS policy and more involvement by student unions from non-Communist developing countries while at the same time pro-Soviet forces had tight control over the organization. The Hungarian uprising of 1956 caused some dissent in the IUS and a number of meetings were cancelled while factional problems were solved. If anything, the more recent conflicts which have attacked the Soviet leadership from the "left" have posed a more serious threat to the IUS than the earlier "non-political" pressures on the organization.

The most volatile of the internal conflicts in the IUS involved the Sino-Soviet dispute. This division in the IUS was a reflection of divisions within all international Communist organizations, and of splits between Communist nations.[42] From 1958 and more dramatically after 1960 until the Chinese effectively withdrew from international student politics in 1968 as part of the Chinese Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the IUS was seriously disrupted by continuing conflict between the pro-Soviet leadership of the organization and the Chinese and their allies. The Chinese were never able to outvote the pro-Soviet forces decisively in the IUS or in other international Communist operations but they were notably successful in the IUS in expressing their views and in obtaining support among some unions for their position.

The Chinese were sucessful not so much in terms of the votes they attracted in IUS meetings--they could count on fewer than twenty votes in their favor on most issues--but on the political impact of their

positions. Many delegations from developing countries, perhaps notably from Latin America and Asia, were greatly attracted to the Chinese position although they did not often feel free to vote openly on the Chinese side. The basis of the Chinese attack on the pro-Soviet position was that the Soviet Union was a conservative great power which did not take the revolutionary aspirations of the Third World countries seriously. The Chinese pointed to Soviet support for the nuclear test treaty and on disarmament in general as a trick which would keep the developing countries permanently under the control of the advanced nations. Chinese tactics appealed to the militant aspirations of many radical students, and also to their feelings of powerlessness in view of strong Soviet domination of the IUS. The Chinese and the Japanese Zengakuren were among the first elements in the IUS who expressed a coherent ideological position and seemed to take their politics seriously. This also had an attraction among ideologically-oriented student leaders.

The Sino-Soviet dispute in the IUS had several results. Most important, it severely disrupted the organization's functioning. Congresses were turned into divisive debating sessions and discussion on policy matters became increasingly difficult. It also proved to IUS members that dissent from the "official" Soviet position was possible. Chinese dissent also exposed Soviet manipulation of the IUS, since the leadership was occasionally forced to threaten recalcitrant unions into voting against the Chinese and often used parliamentary maneuvers against the Chinese.

The reaction of the IUS leadership was sharp and often quite harsh, but not very effective politically. The retained leadership of the IUS because of their overwhelming strength of votes and their entrenched position in the secretariat and on the executive council. The leadership generally avoided attacking the Chinese directly until they themselves were criticized, but then they reacted vehemently. In addition, the Chinese position received no hearing in IUS publications and it was not uncommon for IUS officials to cut off the translation facilities or even the microphone during a speech by the Chinese or their allies in international meetings. While the Chinese forced the IUS leadership to take a more militant position on some issues--for example giving greater emphasis to the questions of national liberation and anti-imperialism--the pro-Soviet group did not basically shift its line during the struggle.

The Chinese were correct, at least in part, in some of their criticisms of the IUS and Soviet Policy. At a time when revolutionary movements and student groups in developing countries were growing more powerful and assertive, the Soviets turned away from their championship of such groups and toward a policy of detente with the West. Even when the Soviets took decisive action--such as the installation of missiles in Cuba in 1962--they were forced in the end to compromise with the United States. It is also likely that the relatively positive response which the Chinese received was indicative of the growing influence of student unions from developing areas in both the IUS and the ISC and the fact that the power of these organizations remained effectively in the hands of the advanced countries.

It is not necessary here fo fully discuss the details of Chinese tactics at international meetings. At such meetings as the Florence

Conference for Peace, Disarmament, and National Independence, in 1964, and at most of the sessions of the IUS executive committee and at IUS Congresses, the Chinese effectively stated their position and gathered a good deal of support for it.

The IUS was faced with another critical problem during this period which was similar to that faced by the ISC. Delegations from developing countries were no longer willing to accept without question the wishes of the organization's leadership and at the 9th IUS Congress, held in Ulan Bator, Mongolia, one of these disputes caused an unprecedented walk-out of a number of delegations. The issue which caused the split was whether to seat a delegation from the Chilean National Student Union (UFUCh). The IUS leadership took the position that since the UFUCh was a representative student union and wished to be given delegate status, it should be granted. Militant Latin American student unions, noting that the Chilean union was controlled by the Christian Democratic party and therefore counter revolutionary, argued that it should be excluded from the IUS.[43] After a long debate lasting many hours, in which IUS President Vokrouhilcky argued that expulsion would limit the broadness of the IUS, with secretariat urging, the Congress decided by a small margin not to expell the Chileans. At that point 11 Latin American unions walked out of the session and, despite many efforts at compromise, did not return.

It was significant that, although the Chinese did not even attend the sessions, the Congress was marked by several conflicts and showed a lack of direction. One observer noted that the Congress reflected some of the uncertainties of the Communist world generally, and certainly was symptomatic of the difficulties the Moscow-oriented Communists had in dealing with the militant student unions from the developing areas.

Since 1967 the IUS has been unable to function effectively due to a number of internal and external problems, and its programs have declined in intensity. No Congress has been held between the Ulan Bator meeting in 1967 and mid-1970, and at one of the meetings of the Executive Council held in 1968 there was very strong opposition to the IUS's lack of a strong position on the 1968 intervention by Soviet troops in Czechoslovakia. It is significant that these new divisions arose despite the demise of the ISC, its only competitor.

The more recent divisions in the IUS can be attributed to a number of factors. The most dramatic of these is the Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia, which created a very strong hostile reaction in the student world and threw the international Communist movement into disarray. The IUS secretariat, located in Prague, could hardly ignore the events, yet it took no position on the intervention. IUS officials stated that reactionaries wanted to use the situation for their purposes and that the IUS would not aid in such a development. This position was, however, not accepted by many member unions. The Czech student union, a hot bed of liberalism in Czechslovakia, threatened to disaffiliate formally with the IUS, but in the long run did not do so.

A number of IUS events were cancelled without explanation including a joint seminar on the United Nations co-sponsored with the International Student Movement for the UN and a seminar on university reform scheduled for Caracas. World Student News was not published according to its usual schedule for a time. A more basic problem for the IUS was and is its lack of relationship with or any role in the many major student movements which have shaken the politics of western (and to a smaller extent eastern) Europe in the recent period. IUS officials have attempted to build ties to these movements and have tried to understand more about the student revolts, but have not been very successful in either of these tasks. Over the long run, if the IUS is unable to relate itself to the active student movements in various countries, its role will be even more circumscribed than it is at present.

The IUS was not alone in facing factional disputes and disruptions based on political differences. The ISC, with its more open structure and wider range of membership, was even more plagued by such problems. The ISC was a more complex organization than the IUS, due in part to its political diversity and in part to its organizational structure. The ISC was founded by a group of Western European student unions, notably those from Scandinavia, Holland, England, and a few others which were commited to the notion of "students as such" and remaining clear of partisan politics. As noted earlier, the service orientation of the pre-war CIE was strong among European ISC unions. The financial basis for ISC activities--the U.S. government--was not as interested in providing services for European students as they were in effectively countering the ideological and political impact of the IUS.

It is significant that the U.S. National Student Association (USNSA), while a member of the dominant European group of student unions within the ISC, emphasized that the ISC should take strong positions on issues important in the struggle with the IUS, such as colonialism and imperialism. In view of the connection between USNSA officials and the CIA, this position is not surprising since the NSA wanted to maintain its influence in the Third World. A final part of the ISC political equation was the impact of student unions from the developing countries. These unions began to affiliate with the ISC as early as 1954, but by 1956 had assumed an important position in the organization and later had the balance of power in international conferences.

The growth of the ISC can be traced with the help of a few statistics. The first ISC, which took place in Stockholm in 1950, was attended by 21 national unions of students, all but three of which were from Western Europe or North America. And these three were the white student unions from South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand. By 1954, the fourth ISC at Istanbul was attended by forty unions, of which sixteen were from non-white countries. The sixth ISC, held in Ceylon in 1956, saw a turning point for the organization. The membership increased to 56, with 32 from non-white countries. The largest ISC took place at Quebec in 1962, when eighty student unions participated, the large majority of which were non-Western. The eleventh ISC, held in New Zealand in 1964, saw participation from 55 unions, in part because of the walk-out of Latin American unions which took place at the previous Quebec sessions. The growth of the ISC was impressive, although many student unions from emerging countries belonged to both the IUS and the ISC and attended congresses of both groups. If anything, the ISC in 1962 was more representative than the IUS because more of its affiliated unions were legitimate spokesmen for their country's students than were many IUS unions. As noted earlier, many IUS unions were 'rump' organizations representing pro-Communist factions among the student community in a given country. Several ISC unions were also unrepresentative, but their numbers were substantially fewer.

The ISC secretariat also saw substantial growth. Beginning with a small staff, the staff of the Coordinating Secretariat in Leiden expanded from 5 to 25 in 1955-56, and the publications and other programs grew proportionately. By 1961, the staff had increased to fifty, including translators and others to assist the senior staff in its work.[44] The senior Coordinating Secretariat staff was composed of students from many countries, but either a large minority or a majority were representatives of the dominant European group. Furthermore, most of the junior staff members, including the editor of the Student and the publications staff, were Europeans or Americans.

The dominant group in the ISC, from its inception until the end, was the so-called "northern group" of European, North American, and Brisish Commonwealth student unions. This group was responsible for the establishment of the organization, for the selection of Leiden as the group's headquarters rather than Paris, and for its basic political direction. A group of student unions, called the "southern group" and led by the French national student union and including some southern European and Latin American unions, from an early date argued for a somewhat more militant position for the ISC. The main challenge to the ISC leadership came when unions from the developing countries began to assert themselves forcefully after 1956.

The exigencies of Cold War politics made themselves felt in the ISC. As one former NSA international staff member put it, after 1955 anti-imperialist struggles in the Third World and the changing position of the Soviet Union and of the IUS had an impact on the ISC.[45] The Ceylon ISC in 1956 was the first time that political questions occupied a major segment of the agenda. The question of Algerian independence received substantial attention and aroused a good deal of debate. The dispute came close to precipitating a crisis in the ISC with the more conservative European unions arguing that these political questions were not a legitimate concern. But, in the end, Algerian independence was supported--the American USNSA taking a strong position in favor of the Algerians--and the ISC did survive.

After 1956, the ISC consciously attempted to establish a viable identity for itself. The growing influence and increasing radicalization and activism of student unions in the Third World came into conflict with the more traditional apolitical views of the European unions. Underlying all these were the financial realities of the ISC and its connection with the Cold War. The 1959 ISC was held in Peru and, aside from a bomb threat to the all-important translation equipment, the meetings were marked by an increasing activism of the Latin American delegations, in part as a result of the success of the Cuban revolution. The ISC moved further toward politicalization and took strong stands on a number of issues such as anticolonialism and racism. At the same time, the ISC was probably at the height of its power and was engaged in an active international program of conferences, publications, and regional meetings. The Peru ISC sessions saw the first major walk-out of delegates: 23 delegations left the meeting over the refusal of the ISC leadership to permit further discussion of a resolution on international student cooperation.[46] A compromise was eventually reached, however, and the boycotting unions returned to the meeting.

The conflicts between the ISC and the IUS became somewhat more direct during this period. Much of this was caused by the IUS change of heart regarding international cooperation. The IUS began to actively seek coordination and communication between itself and the ISC and even hinted at some sort of merger between the two organizations. This change in policy was due on part to changes in international Communist strategy at the time and to a realization that the ISC was making a good deal of headway among student unions from developing countries at a time when the IUS was having more limited success. The ISC, for various reasons, resisted these efforts at unity and took a strong stand in favor of its own organizational identity and its ostensibly non-political stand. A seminar held in Switzerland in 1963 attempted to provide an intellectual and political grounds for the ISC's "hard line" position against student unity.[47] Ironically, one of the arguments advanced by the ISC was that the student internationals had to be based on autonomous student unions free of any national government sanction and that many of the IUS unions could claim no such independence. As a means of adapting to the wishes of unions from the developing countries, support was given to a greater degree of non-partisan social concern. While the intellectual basis of the ISC's position was not very convincing to some unions, the organization did manage to resist overtures toward unification up to its collapse.

The most serious challenge to the ISC's leadership came at the Quebec ISC in 1962. A seemingly unimportant dispute concerning the seating of a delegation of students from the Puerto Rican Federation of Students for Independence (FUPI) caused a major debate within the ISC and eventually a walk-out of 23 unions. The ISC leadership did not wish to seat the FUPI delegation because they claimed that it was unrepresentative of Puerto Rican students. But the dispute had other major considerations. The fact that Puerto Rico is an American colony and the USNSA was opposed to the seating of the FUPI delegation caused some delegations to look more favorably on FUPI. In addition, the issue was seen in part as a dispute between the "Northern" leadership group and other elements in the ISC. The French UNEF, long in opposition to the dominant group in the ISC, strongly supported the Puerto Ricans. FUPI's main support came, however, from Latin American student unions. After several days of round-the-clock debate, the conference refused to seat FUPI, and the 23 unions left the meeting and did not return.[48]

The Quebec ISC caused the secretariat to do some serious rethinking concerning the future and direction of the ISC, and the following conference,[49] held in New Zealand in 1964, reflected this disenchantment with the direction of the ISC. The leadership, while naturally favoring an expanding membership and broader concerns for the ISC, was unwilling to give up its own position. Many European unions were unhappy with the increasing politicization of the ISC and its emphasis on programs relating to developing countries. Thus, the eleventh ISC, held in 1964, made some sharp breaks with the past. It was held in a nearly inaccessable place--New Zealand--which necessitated the granting of travel funds in order for almost all unions to attend. The Coordinating Secretariat did not grant travel grants to any of the unions which had walked out of the Quebec meetings and which had not made amends for their actions. Therefore, many unions which might be expected to be in opposition to the ISC leadership did not attend. The IUS observer delegation, curiously, was denied visas by the New Zealand authorities and, thus, were not present either.

The most serious work of the 11th ISC was organizational. A Charter was proposed and approved, allegiance to which was to form the basis for ISC membership. The charter introduced the criteria of adherence to democratic processes in the internal workings of affiliated unions, thus substantially narrowing the basis for membership. The Coordinating Secretariat was also strengthened and given substantial executive authority. Although the charter was debated at length by the conference, there were no major changes made, and the conference had no major disagreements. The absence of many dissenting unions certainly added to the tranquility of the meeting.[50] Each of the unions attending the conference, as well as those who wished later to join the ISC, had to officially ratify the new Charter. A major embarassment came when the National Union of Students of England, Wales, and Northern Ireland, (NUSEWNI), one of the mainstays of the ISC ruling group temporarily refused to ratify the document due to the influence of leftist elements at the NUSEWNI congress. But in general, most of the unions present at the New Zealand did approve the document.

The ISC Charter somewhat changed the nature of the ISC and, in some respects, made it more similar to the IUS. Its vaunted nonpolitical nature was to some extent destroyed, since the Charter had some explicit political assumptions in it in that the autonomy of unions was demanded and a commitment made to university autonomy. In addition, the traditionally weak secretariat was considerably strengthened. It is very possible that the ISC felt under many of the same pressures as did the IUS from student unions, largely from developing countries. which were expressing their views more forcefully. The last ISC was held in Nairobi, Kenya, in August, 1966, less than a year before the revelation concerning the ISC-CIA relationship. According to one observer, the efforts to eliminate factional differences which the Charter attempted did not work. The Nairobi meeting was marked by numerous acrimonious debates, with major differences on policy issues between the conservative majority (Commonwealth plus European unions) and the progressive minority (Latin Americans, USNSA, and Germany).[51] Another observer noted that the Charter was an effort to circumscribe the ISC, and that the Supervision Committee, controlled by the "ruling group" had the power to interpret the Charter.[52] He concluded his report by stating that the ISC had become the "Rotary Club" of the international student world. Thus, the Nairobi ISC could not be seen as a complete success. Seventy-one unions attended the meetings--down from the eighty present four years previously.[53]

The ISC continued to engage in an active program following the Nairobi conference until the crisis over the organization's financial backing, but it was clear that there were major political problems within the organization just as there were in the IUS at this period. ISC programs came to a rather abrupt end after the revelations of its financial relations with the CIA. Some programs were continued and the Student appeared irregularly during 1967, although its format was changed to reduce costs. An ISC Bulletin was also established to take the place of several other publications, again in order to reduce expenditures. But in the last analysis, the ISC could not function without outside financial assistance.

ISC leaders tried to minimize the implications of the organization's financial links. At first, ISC officials denied the relationship and, when this was no longer possible, an investigation commission was established to examine the question. Its report did not fully deny the financial links, but stated that no outside influences dictated ISC programs or policies. The report also attempted to place some of the blame for the situation on the American staff members of the organization, who were said to have left the other staff uninformed of the true situation.[54] In the meantime, the USNSA withdrew from the ISC and was no longer participating actively in international student affairs. But these efforts were to no avail, as it was impossible to continue to operate programs without funds. The thirteenth ISC, called for February, 1969 in Austria, could not be held due to lack of funds for travel grants, and in February, 1969, the Supervision Committee met in Leiden and formally dissolved the organization. The Committee stated that, in addition to a financial crisis, the consensus among European student unions had broken down and that a substantial radicalization had taken place. It was at this period that the French UNEF was involved in militant political activities in France in the wake of the May, 1968 student revolt. The German student union, the VDS, was taken over by the militant socialist SDS.

After February of 1969, the International Union of Students had no effective competition and it has remained the only fully functioning international student organization. Yet as has been noted, the IUS had its own problems and was unable to take advantage of its unique situation. Confused by student radicalism in Europe, by ideological divergence in both advanced and developing countries, and by rapid shifts in international Communist strategy, the IUS carried out few programs and seemed to be limited to statements of solidarity with various struggles around the world. The IUS is clearly not "where the action is" and, furthermore, it has been seriously compromised by close links with the great powers and the Cold War in a period of rapid political change and of polycentrism in both East and West.

The previous sections have provided a rather general discussion of both the activities and the political posture of the international student movement. This has been by no means complete; however, it is hoped that this analysis has indicated both the scope of the activities and the links of the international student movement to broader political trends. No effort has been made to create any "demonologies" concerning the student internationals. Neither major international student organization was free to end ties to adult political groups or to the Cold War. While it is debateable whether the substantial sums spent on the international student organizations were "worth it", it is clear that the organizations did provide some services and were a communication link. Yet, they had little influence on the rank and file of the world's student community, and did not even have a major effect on the dramatic events which have taken place among university students during the decade of the 1960's.

Festivals and Forums: Bread and Circuses for the Students

One aspect of the international student movement has been neglected in the previous discussions which deserves some analysis. The International Union of Students and the World Federation of Democratic Youth sponsored a series of World Youth Festivals and Forums during the period between 1947 and 1968. These events were generally massive in size and extremely expensive to operate. As many as 35,000 young people from all over the world attended these festivals, which were estimated to cost up to $100 million each.[55] Western student and youth organizations had no counterparts for these events, which were sponsored and carefully managed by Communist groups. The ostensible purpose of the festivals was to bring youth from around the world together to foster international understanding and cooperation and to demonstrate that young people are in favor of peace and national self-determination. An important aim, from the viewpoint of the sponsors, was to show the "superiority" of the socialist countries, since all but two of the festivals were held in Eastern Europe, Many thousands of students from developing areas were provided an opportunity to travel, were exposed to the ideological position of the IUS and the WFDY, and many were given free trips to various Eastern European countries following the festival.

The World Youth Festivals combined the atmosphere of a carnival and cultural exchange with a political rally. While the views of the IUS and WFDY were actively presented and met with little opposition, the propaganda barrage was secondary to the overall experience of the Festivals. It is unlikely that many delegates were greatly influenced by the Festivals if they had previously formulated political views. Thus, it is questionable that the tremendous amounts of money spent by Eastern European governments on these events provided great dividends. Yet, nine world youth festivals were held with substantial fanfare and a great deal of difficult organizational work.

The first World Youth Festival was held in Prague in 1947 and approximately 20,000 young people from 67 countries attended. Succeeding festivals were held in Budapest (1949), East Berlin (1951), Bucharest (1953), Warsaw (1955), Moscow (1957), Vienna (1959), Helsinki (1962), and Sofia (1968).[56] Despite the differences in location, the festivals (with the exceptions of Vienna and Helsinki) were remarkably similar. A complex web of events lasting for a week and featuring cultural shows, sporting events, dramatic presentations, political rallies, meetings between the delegations of various countries, and discussions on topics ranging from problems of young farmers to the Vietnam war were the mainstay of festival programming. The political orientation of the programs was very clear and, if anything, too blatant for many sophisticated students from developing countries.

Observers note that many students did not take the events themselves very seriously, but used the opportunity for making informal contacts and enjoying a "free" vacation in a foreign country. After 1959, the organizers made special efforts to attract students from developing areas and actually succeeded in bringing thousands of them to festivals. For the most part, Western non-Communist student and youth groups boycotted the festivals, perceiving them to be propaganda activities of the IUS and WFDY. Thus Western participation was minimal, although there were representatives from many Western countries, usually from Communist or other radical groups.[57] Thus, the participation in the festivals was fairly one-sided and, despite festival officials' claims that the events were non-political, politics were apparently very much at their forefront.

The three most recent festivals show marked changes from previous events, and indicate some of the developments occurring both in the IUS and in politics in general. By the late 1950's, IUS and WFDY officials recognized the need for broadening the base of participation in the festivals and for making them more attractive to young people from non-Communist countries. Thus, in 1959 for the first time, a Festival was held in Vienna. The size of the event was down to 17,000 participants from the more than 35,000 who had attended the previous one in Moscow in 1957. But there was a much larger percentage from the developing areas and somewhat greater participation from Western Europe. The organizers, however, encountered a number of new problems when they held the festival in neutral Austria. The Austrian youth and student organizations did not participate in the festival and, in fact, actually opposed it. Furthermore, political opposition to the festival was possible outside the Soviet bloc, and much anti-Communist literature was distributed. Similar events occured two years later in Helsinki, thus causing substantial embarassment to the organizers.

The Sofia festival, held after a two-year delay because of successive coups at previous festival sites in Algeria and Ghana, presented entirely new problems. Despite the best efforts of the festival organizers and the strong repressive tactics of the Bulgarian police, there was substantial oppositional activity. The event took place in the midst of the upsurge in student activism and militancy in Europe, and radical--and anti-Soviet--student delegations from France, West Germany, Czechoslovakia, and other countries attended the festival and engaged in demonstrations and other activities. At this festival, it was the radicalism of a number of student groups which embarassed the IUS and WFDY officials. While police tactics prevented radical European students from completely disrupting the festival, the European students did succeed in presenting their position to large numbers of participants. At least one observer noted that the Sofia festival might be the last one due to disruptions and political problems encountered by the organizers.[58]

A word should also be said about the World Youth Forums, two of which were held in Moscow in 1961 and 1964.[59] These events were similar to the festivals in that they were well-planned large international events with participants from many countries (although few came from the West), but different in that the orientation was more intellectual, and they were less massive. The bulk of the forums consisted of workshops on topics such as problems of youth, peaceful coexistence, and imperialism which presented reports to plenary sessions for approval. The forums also prepared a final statement which generally reflected the Soviet position on international affairs. As in the case of the festivals, the forums were quite expensive for the Soviet government, which bore most of the cost. More than 1,000 youth and student leaders were transported to Moscow and given lavish hospitality. Many were later given tours of the Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries.

The forums, particularly the "Second World Youth Forum of Solidarity of Youth and Students in the Fight for National Independence and Liberation, for Peace," held in 1964 were related to Soviet foreign policy interests as well as a general wish to enhance the image of the Soviet Union in developing countries. The second forum was also related to the Sino-Soviet dispute, and was the scene of numerous disputes between Soviet and Chinese representatives. The Soviet Union wanted to have massive support for its views from such international gatherings and after much acrimonious debate, they did obtain a strong final document which favored the Soviet position. As was the case with the festivals, most of the delegates were not greatly interested in these polemical disputes and many did not take the proceedings very seriously.

Given the massive expenses involved with the organization of world youth festivals, and the poltical problems they encountered. during the recent past, it is difficult for the observer to see why these events were so enthusiastically organized for a period of twenty years. The propaganda value was limited, in the main, to students and youth from the Eastern European countries themselves, who clearly relished the opportunity to interact with young people from other countries and to travel, even if only to a neighboring country. It is difficult to measure their influence on non-Communist students, but it is as likely that as many were alienated by heavy-handed propaganda as impressed by the massive programming. Furthermore, Western young people were not affected at all by the events. It is likely that the rationale for the festivals can be found in the psychology and tactics of Soviet youth and student leaders and their colleagues in Eastern Europe. While the festivals were certainly spectacles of the first order, it is unlikely that their political impact either on student unions or on individuals was very deep.

The IUS and the ISC: An Evaluation

A full evaluation of the two major international student organizations is not possible within the context of this essay. Little data of a sociological nature is available, for example, on the impact of participation in the international groups or concerning the kinds of individuals who participated. Nevertheless, a few observations can be made.

Some of the results of the international student groups can be considered negative. Many of their more astute participants and observers were either aware or became aware that organizations were closely linked to the Cold War and to the politics of the great powers and that, in fact, there were relatively few opportunities for democratic decision-making. This was probably a rather disillusioning experience for many. The international student groups, on occasion, intervened in the student affairs of various countries, particularly in the developing areas. Financial and technical aid was given to unions which supported the position of the IUS or ISC without regard to the representativeness of the union or the situation in the country. As a result, student organizations of an artifical nature were kept alive by foreign subsidies and support. The infusion of international student politics on the domestic scene of several developing countries also had negative effects on the student organizations in the particular countries involved. The case of India, mentioned earlier, is most dramatic in this regard. The United States was also a victim of this kind of interference. The subvention by the CIA of the U.S. National Student Association certainly had a major impact on the NSA and possibly on student political life in the U.S.

It can be argued that the millions of dollars spent on the international student organizations might have been spent to greater advantage elsewhere. However, it is possible that the American and Soviet governments received substantial dividends for their expenditures. After all, the student internationals were rather inexpensive when compared to official government bureaus such as the U.S. Information Agency or the Novosti Press Agency. Regardless of whether the Great Powers received propaganda advantages from their activities in the student community, it is true that no effective international student movement was created. But perhaps the main negative aspects of the two student internationals was the fact that they were linked, in part secretly, to the Cold War and that these links corrupted the organizations and possibly many of the individuals and national unions involved in them. It is very difficult to measure corruption or to quantify this kind of impact on an individual or organization. Yet, it seems clear that the kinds of devious machinations necessary to operate an international organization on one level while holding other aims for it on a different level was damaging both for the orgainzations and for individuals. It is, in addition, at least possible that the governments involved used the international student groups for intelligence work on a rather low level, and this cannot have been beneficial to the student internationals.

The basic fact of the student internationals was their irrelevance to the events taking place among university students around the world. Many of the leaders of national activist movements rejected the notion that they should be involved in the internationals and wished that the ISC and IUS would confine themselves to providing services to those who asked for them. Yet, the international student groups expressed more lofty ambitions and wanted to serve as a means of communication and coordination and, at times, of leadership for students around the world. It would seem that this role was performed only sporadically by the organizations. The burning issues among the world's students--questions such as racism, anti-imperialism, university reform, and militant protest activity against government policy took place entirely outside the context of the student internationals, and perhaps despite their efforts.

Despite these negative aspects, the international student groups did provide some positive services. Many of these have been mentioned in this essay. International and regional meetings provided a meeting place for some student leaders and made informal communication possible. Travel funds otherwise unavailable were provided to student leaders from a variety of countries. The international student groups assisted in setting up regional student conferences and organizations, and these maintained a degree of independence and provided an opportunity for regional student cooperation. International support of student sports and dramatic groups was also very useful. The publications of the international student organizations, while having only a limited circulation among students and often presenting irrelevant material, did provide an educational outlet for many student leaders and focused on international themes. The Research and Information Commission of the ISC prepared detailed reports on the student and educational situation in a number of countries and made these reports available to interested students. Finally, the international student organizations did provide a kind of political education to student leaders from many countries. While part of this education may have been negative, valuable training in public speaking, parliamentary procedures, and an aquaintance with international issues was given.

A balanced evaluation of the two international student organizations is difficult. The student community is not much worse off because of the demise of the International Student Conference or the relative inactivity of the International Union of Students. Yet, some events do not take place because of the inactivity of the international groups such as cultural and other meetings. What would be feasible perhaps, in view of the impossibility of independent funding for expensive international student activities, is for the financial basis of international student activities of various kinds be open. In that way, the services could be provided, but student unions would know that extra-student political motivations were involved. Even better would be for an agency like the United Nations to have funds available for an active program of service to the student community.

The "Other" International Student Groups

Most of the discussion in this essay has been concerned with the two major international student groups, the IUS and the ISC. Yet, these groups are not the only ones that have served students throughout the world. This section deals with some of the other student organizations which coordinate national student activities and organizations and attempt to serve students such as World University Service and World Student Christian Federation. The discussion is necessarily incomplete since there are a large number of groups involved and limited data is available concerning many of them. It is clear that almost none of the international groups under discussion have been able to fund themselves independent of external subsidies-all have received some kind of outside funding, some openly and some covertly. Some of the groups such as the International Union of Young Christian Democrats have limited themselves to publishing a small journal or coordinating an international conference once every few years. Others have active programs of coordination, meetings, and publications. Some are directly political; others are religious, cultural, or service oriented. In short, there is a wide range of organizations serving students on a number of levels.

It is significant that the "new left" has been unable to set up any kind of international coordinating agency and that no international student group represents the new militant activist student movements of various countries. This is especially important because most of these movements have a strong sense of international solidarity as well many common ideological concerns and tactical approaches. At least one book has been published which purports to be a "handbook of the international radical left."[60] While several journals are read by the more serious of new left activists, there is no one magazine which serves the international new left.[61]

New left student groups have made efforts to coordinate their activities and, on several occasions, have attempted to create an international coordinating agency. One of the earliest efforts at international joint action by new left students was the "International Days of Protest" against the Vietnam war in 1965. Coordination between radical students in Japan, the United States, and several Western European countries produced massive demonstrations in a dozen countries around the Vietnam question at the same time. The basic idea stemmed from the Berkeley Vietnam Day Committee, the successor to the Free Speech Movement of 1964, and was coordinated by an informal means to other countries. More recently, new left students have been impressed by events in other countries and have launched demonstrations in the wake of successful student movements in France in 1968. There was apparently little, if any, direct coordination between the French students and students in England, West Gernany, and the United States, where demonstrations occured shortly after the Paris "events" of 1968.

Several international conferences of new left activists have been held, and at least one organization set up. However, none of these efforts has lasted. One of the first international new left meetings was organized by the militant Zengakuren in Japan in the mid-1960's to create a radical anti-war international organization which could act independently of the IUS. This meeting drew only a few representatives of student movements in other countries. Meetings in 1968 and 1969 in New York and London also attempted to unite radical student movements in Western Europe and the United States, but factional problems, general inertia, and other difficulties prevented the creation of an organization. One group was set up, but it lasted only a short time, and proved unable to create a continuing agency. This group, the Revolutionary Socialist Students' Federation, emerged out of an international meeting in London, and had its headquarters there.

There are a number of reasons for the lack of an international new left organization. One of the hard facts which the organizers of the various new left international conferences learned is that it is quite expensive to conduct one meeting on an international scale and much more expensive to try to operate a functioning organization on the international level. Radical student groups, even if they could obtain these funds, would more likely use them to operate internal programs than on international coordination. The new left, partially in reaction to highly structured "old left" political parties, has had a strong anti-organizational bias in any case. The organizational looseness has resulted in near anarchy and in factional disputes which have split activist groups and diminished their effectiveness.[62] This situation has made effective international cooperation on a long term basis difficult. The spontaneity which has been a hallmark of student movements in advanced countries has been a strength in terms of mass demonstrations but a drawback concerning effective organizational development.

New Left activism in many countries has increasingly been aimed at creating a revolutionary situation, and student groups are convinced that such a revolutionary movement must function in secret. The organization of an effective international student agency would be quite difficult under conditions of secrecy, even if it were considered desirable. International coordination of specific demonstrations and activities needs no expensive and cumbersome bureaucracy, and it is likely that continued ad hoc cooperation will continue to occur.

Student political organizations with adult sponsorship or adult allies have had an easier time organizing internationally. There is at present no openly communist international student or youth organization, although such an organization, the Young Communist International (YCI) existed in the period following the Russian revolution. Communist student groups function through the International Union of Students or the World Federation of Democratic Youth, or in various ad hoc arrangements. The Social Democratic parties had, until recently, an active youth international, the International Union of Socialist Youth (IUSY), which had its headquarters in Vienna. The IUSY published a quarterly magazine, had periodic conferences, and sponsored delegations of socialist youth to visit different countries. The IUSY was discovered to have accepted funds from one of the CIA-funded American foundations, and was greatly embarassed by these revelations. While it is not known if the IUSY has officially disbanded, it has been fairly inactive since 1968. The IUSY claimed more than thirty affiliates around the world, most of which were the youth or student branches of various social democratic political parties.

Since 1962, the International Union of Young Christian Democrats (IUYCD) has carried on an active program, and has had several international conferences. While not many specifically student groups affiliated to the IUYCD, it is a notable new organization in that it is rare for conservative or moderate youth groups to organize effectively on the international level. Another moderate political organization, the World Federation of Liberal and Radical Youth (WFLRY) was also founded in the 1960's, and held an international conference in 1968. This meeting attracted 75 delegates from thirty countries, and passed resolutions for the recognition of East Germany, for the abolition of NATO and the Warsaw Pact, and placed stress on the necessity for educational reform. It is not know which adult political organizations support this new grouping, although it is clear that independent sponsorship would be impossible. Political tendancies of all ideological persuasions have attempted to provide a forum for youth and students to meet internationally and, for the most part, have subsidized these organizations. Most of these organizations are not limited exclusively to students, but many of the participants are students. None of the groups formed recently has been able to carry out very active programs, and most are limited to international congresses every year or once in several years.

One of the most important aspects of the international student movement has been student relief services. As has been noted earlier, the IUS and the ISC both were involved to some extent in student relief activities and, although their efforts were in part linked to politics, much useful work was done. The World University Service (WUS) is perhaps the largest student relief agency and it too has been linked to Western financial sources, particularly to American foundations, some of which had links to the U.S. government. Nevertheless, the WUS has continued to function. WUS has aided students in countries where natural calamities have occured and has also helped students who were victims of political struggles. More than $150,000 was raised to provide scholarships to Hungarian students after the 1956 revolution in that country. Algerian refugee students were also aided by WUS. WUS has, not surprisingly, been especially involved in aiding students from developing countries. A predecessor to WUS was an agency called World Student Relief (WSR), which played an important role in providing aid to students in post-war Europe. While the IUS was involved with WSR in its early period, political interests caused the IUS to withdraw and operate its own student relief program, although on a much reduced scale.[63]

The ISC's main relief and scholarship agency was the International Universities Exchange Fund (IUEF), which has been mentioned earlier. This agency has mainly provided scholarships for students in countries involved in struggles against colonialism. In 1966-67, the IUEF provided $300,000 in scholarships. It also raised $135,000 for higher education in the High Commission territories in southern Africa. It is difficult to estimate the total amount of aid provided by the various student relief agencies, but it is fair to state that at least one million dollars has been given in direct relief to students in many countries, and hundreds of scholarships provided to needy students.

Religious international student organizations are perhaps the oldest existing international groups, and they have been important for students of particular religious persuasions. Most major religions have one or more such international organizations, some general groups and some aimed at particular activities, such as missions. Protestant international student organizations have existed since the 19th century. The World Student Christian Federation (WSCF) is one of the most active of the international student religious groups. It sponsors periodic international conferences which attract as many as 300 students from all over the world, with substantial participation from developing countries. The WSCF has an international headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland, as well as several regional officies. It produces a quarterly journal and also publishes books and pamphlets. WSCF has taken a strong interest in social action questions and has taken stands on colonialism, educational reform, and other non-religious issues. The major amount of WSCF finances come from the World Council of Churches (WCC), although the theological and political positions of the WSCF are probably well to the left of the WCC. Another Protestsnt international group is the World Council of the YMCA's. Its scope can be seen by the fact that its fourth council meeting attracted 400 delegates from 54 countries to Tokyo. It is less active than the WSCF, but provides a link for YMCA groups around the world.

Roman Catholic student organizationss have also been formed and have, in general, been a liberal force within Catholicism. The most important of these groups is Pax Romana with affiliates in more than fifty countries. Pax Romana holds periodic conferences, publishes an international journal, and carries on a continuing program. It has taken a major interest in its affiliates in developing countries, and has tried to provide assistance to them. A World Union of Jewish Students has been actively functioning as a link between Jewish students since before World War II. Buddhist student groups, under Japanese guidance, have recently tried to organize an international organization and conference, but it is not yet clear whether a permanent organization will emerge. It is also unknown whether there is a specifically student-oriented group catering to Moslem students around the world. It is unlikely that such a group exists, given the diversity of views within the Moslem community. The religious international organizations have been generally liberal and concerned with social issues, but not basically political in nature. They have involved thousands of students in their work, and probably have had an effect on their affiliates in various countries in terms of heightening their awareness of international issues.

One of the most important aspects of the student international organizations has been the various regional student groupings which have developed. Some of these have been aided by the ISC or the IUS, and these have been mentioned briefly earlier in this essay. But many have developed independently and have made an important contribution to international cooperation among students. Among the earliest efforts at international cooperation among student groups were several Latin American student meetings. The famous "reforma" of the Latin American universities which gave a share of institutional power to students in 1919, started in Argentina but was spread throughout the continent by a series of conferences in the 1920's. The first formal Ibero American Congress of Students was held in Mexico City in 1931 and it focused on the problem of dictatorships in Latin America. A meeting held in 1933 strongly criticized U.S. imperialism, a persistent theme of student movements in Latin America.

Latin American students continued their regional contacts in the post-war period as well, and a series of Latin American Student Congresses were held. These meetings, although independent, were aided financially by both the ISC and the IUS and were, in part, involved in the political struggles of the student internationals. The 1961 LASC, for example, held in Brazil, indicated that there was a major split in the Latin American student movement. The more radical groups, greatly strengthened by the example of Castro's successful revolution in Cuba, were gaining support while more moderate elements, many of whom were affiliated to the ISC, were on the decline.[65] The following congress, held significantly in Havana in 1966, included 100 representatives from 22 Latin American countries. The tone of the meeting was radical, and most of the problems of Latin American universities were blamed on the impact of American imperialism. One of the results of this conference was the establishment of the Continental Latin American Organization of Students (OCLAE), with headquarters in Havana. This group has continued to function, although it has been difficult to adequately coordinate events because of Cuba's isolation. Despite factionalism and other political problems, however, the LASC proved that ongoing and useful regional student meetings could exist and could from time to time make real contributions to the national student organizations affiliated to them.

African students, perhaps following the Latin American example and possibly stimulated by the Organization of African Unity, planned the first Pan African Student Conference (PASC) for Tunisia in 1958. With some financial assistance from the Tunisian government, the PASC involved students from many independent African countries and also from some areas under colonial rule. This conference, and others held later, spent time in discussing both university-related problems and broader political issues. The African student community is very much concerned with the liberation of areas of the African continent still controlled by colonial governments, and African student gatherings inevitably spend time discussing these questions. PASC has, in general, managed to keep itself reasonably free of ISC-IUS rivalries, despite the fact that both groups have occasionally contributed funds for African regional meetings.

Asian students have been least active in promoting regional cooperation independent of the IUS and ISC. This is perhaps due to the disorganization of a number of Asian national unions of students, and possibly to the great distances involved and the cultural and linguistic differences among the countries. Although the IUS sponsored the famous Calcutta conference of youth and students in 1948, it has not been especially active in the region since then. The one exception was a student conference attended by 26 Asian and African student organizations in Indonesia in 1956, patterned on the previous conference of Afro-Asian heads of state. This meeting produced little except denunciationsof imperialism, and has had no lasting results and no Afro-Asian student group has been established. The ISC was active more recently in Asia sponsoring a series of regional seminars on specific topics for Asian student leaders. Among these meetings were a series of regional "consultations" at which student leaders discussed such problems as the role of students in national development, regional cooperation, and economic relations. These seminars were small, with perhaps forty participants, but they provided a chance for detailed discussion of circumscribed issues and avoided some of the political rhetoric of IUS-sponsored meetings. None of these conferences, however, led to a permanent Asian student organization.

In addition to the regional meetings mentioned here, both the IUS and the ISC sponsored a series of "special interest" international gatherings which were of some importance. Some of these have been mentioned previously, but they should also be noted in this discussion of regional and other non-political student meetings. Regular conferences on the student press, student travel, drama, sports, film, and other subjects were organized by one or the other international student group, with occasional cooperation between them. These meetings were among the most successful programs of either of the international student organizations. The ISC organized a number of regional meetings devoted to specific topics. Several conferences on higher education in Europe were held with substantial participation from Western European student unions. A number of European student welfare conferences were also organized under ISC auspices. As noted earlier, the IUS in its early days also hosted a number of these "special interest" meetings on such topics as chess, student health, and education. It should be noted that these meetings would have been impossible without the financial backing of the international student groups, although they were generally non-political and perhaps among the most useful aspects of IUS and ISC programming.

Several other groups more difficult to categorize should also be mentioned in this section on regional and other international student groups. Britain and France have traditionally attracted large numbers of foreign students, with the United States and to a lesser extent the Soviet Union becoming more important recently. Overseas students in Britain and France established organizations to reflect their needs as students in a foreign country as well as their political aspirations. The oldest of these groups, the West African Students Union (WASU) was founded in London in 1925. The WASU had the support of the West African Congress, an adult nationalist organization, and succeeded in amalgamating the various student societies from the Gold Coast, Nigeria, and several other British Colonies. The WASU opened a hostel in London in 1933, and also attempted to extend its activities back to the West African countries themselves. Many of the early members of the organization became important leaders, including Kwame Nkrumah, Jomo Kenyetta, and Alex Queson-Sacky. By the 1940's, WASU became involved in radical politics and was influenced by Marxist thought.[66] In the period since the second World War, it has had less of an impact on African students in England and has also become substantially more radical. The WASU has been a member of the IUS since the beginning, although it has been at times critical of IUS policies. The Paris-based counterpart of WASU is the Federation of Black African Students in France (FEANF), which was founded in 1945 using WASU as its model.

Like WASU, many of its former members have assumed positions of power in most of the former French African countries. FEANF's major policy was the achievement of independence for Africa, but it also shared WASU's radical politics, and it has been a long standing member of the IUS.

Organizations of students from specific countries who are studying abroad do not come under the definition of international student organization, but since they are a relatively new phenomenon on the student scene and have been important in some cases, they should at least be mentioned here. With the numbers of students from developing countries studying abroad increasing rapidly--there were in 1968 more than 110,000 foreign students in the United States and some 17,000 in England--these students have become an important element. In a number of cases, they have organized strong groups in their host countries and, in a few instances, have formed federations of students from a particular country studying abroad. The most militant and active of these federations is the Confederation of Iranian Students (CIS), which includes the very large number of students from Iran studying in the U.S., West Germany, and several other European countries. Because of the authoritarianism of the Iranian government, the CIS is one of the most militant anti-government organizations in existence and it is therefore, quite important. The CIS functions among Iranian students and has taken radical stands on many international issues. It also is affiliated with the IUS.

In general, however, organizations of foreign students are less politically oriented and also less active. African students in the U.S. have developed a strong and fairly militant organization in recent years and Indian students have a large group, but it is not generally politically oriented. In the case of the Indian students and students of many other countries as well, their governments through embassies in Washington, provide assistance and guidance to organizations of their student nationals studying in the U.S.

A final organization in this category of "other" international groups worthy of mention is the International Student Movement for the United Nations (ISMUN). Founded as the Student Commission of the World Federation of United Nations Associations in 1947, ISMUN carries on a program of discussions concerning the UN. Its main purpose is to develop support among students for the UN and its specialized agencies. Although ISMUN sends observers to the meetings of IUS, ISC, and other groups, it has tried to steer away from partisan political issues. ISMUN reflects the tradition of an international student group which supported the League of Nations and, thus, has a history dating back to the 1920's.

This essay has been concerned with international student organizations but there are links between the student organizations and the international youth groups, and a note concerning these latter organizations is relevant here. The World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY), which has been mentioned previously, was the first international organization to appeal to youth on a world-wide and ostensibly non-political basis. Some student groups were affiliated to the WFDY, but after the founding of the IUS, its membership was generally limited to non-student youth. The WFDY was founded at an international conference in London in 1945 and, from the start, it was evident that the organization was dominated by Communists. Within a year most of the non-Communist youth organizations withdrew, and in 1949 the World Assembly of Youth (WAY) was founded at a meeting of more than 100 representatives of youth organizations from 37 countries. As of 1964, WAY had representatives from 109 countries at its Assembly. WFDY and WAY function in similar manners. Both have periodicals and both sponsor various regional as well as international conferences once in several years. WAY has tried to keep clear of partisan politics more than WFDY has, but it is clear that both are tied to the respective sides in the Cold War, just as the international student organizations are. Both WFDY and WAY are larger than either of the student internationals, and both include a range of organizations, from young farmers groups to artists organizations, as members. WAY is composed of national committees which represent a range of youth organizations within a particular country, while WFDY accepts affiliations from specific national youth organizations. The U.S. Youth Council is the American affiliate of WAY. There is no American member in WFDY.

The United States and the Student Internationals

American students have been involved in international student activities on a substantial scale since World War II, and to a degree since the 1920's. As has been noted earlier, without American government support the International Student Conference could not have functioned. In addition, the U.S. National Student Association (USNSA) carried on its own active international program during the 1950's and 60's. Thus, it is important to examine the role of American students in international student politics. This discussion must necessarily be brief, if only because it is somewhat beyond the scope of the present research and adequate analysis concerning the National Student Association does not exist. This analysis is limited, therefore, to a rather general discussion of the international role of the NSA and some of its ramifications.[67]

As has been noted previously, the formation of the IUS influenced the beginnings of the NSA since it was started at the initiative of members of the American delegation to the Prague IUS congress in 1946. Members of the US delegation to the Prague congress called a conference in Chicago in 1947 to discuss setting up a national student organization in the United States. This meeting was followed by the first National Student Congress, held in Madison, Wisconsin in August 1948. The NSA emerged out of this congress, which was attended by some 500 delegates from more than 300 colleges and universities. One of the most volatile subjects at the meeting was a decision whether the NSA should cease cooperating with the IUS because of the increasingly pro-Communist position of the IUS. After a debate, it was decided not to engage in further relations with the IUS.

From the beginning, the NSA reflected a "mainstream" liberal political position--a position which it has maintained throughout its history. Both conservative and radical elements attended its early conventions, but these groups had little impact on the decisions made by the congresses. On the right, Catholic student representatives urged that the NSA take a "hard" line toward Communists, while some radical students and a few Communists urged that ties with the IUS be maintained and that the NSA oppose the Cold War. But many Congress decisions were made more on the basis of regional alliances and other factors than because of partisan politics.

Despite the wishes of its founders, the NSA never became a real spokesman for American students, and never played a major role on individual campuses. As a federation of student governments and not a membership organization, the NSA was one step removed from the student community. In addition, many of those who became involved in NSA activities were "professional" student politicians and were not very interested in building active student movements on campus. While the NSA was, and still is, the largest student organization in the United States, it is fair to say that only a minority of its "members" aware of its activities. Its impact on the political consciousness and opinions of its members has been minimal, although in a few instances, such as during the civil rights movements of the early 1960's, the NSA was instrumental in providing support for an active student movement. The international program, if anything, was even more removed from the mainstream of American student life and aroused little interest among students on the campuses. This isolation and relative unimportance should be kept in mind in any discussion of the role of the NSA.

As has been noted, the NSA was a critical factor in the ISC and in non-Communist international student politics from 1950 until the disclosure of the links between the NSA and the CIA in 1967. The main source of NSA's international budget as well as much of its domestic budget was the Foundation for Youth and Student Affairs (FYSA), which was established in 1952. This New York-based foundation was one of the main "conduits" for CIA funds during the entire period under discussion.[68] Virtually all of the NSA's international budget came from FYSA. One of the first major international programs of the NSA was a tour by NSA leaders of various countries to assess student needs. This was followed by NSA participation in the first International Student Conference in Stockholm and the setting up of an international office in Boston which published a newsletter, the International Student Information Service.[69]

From 1950 onward, the NSA's international program grew in size and scope. NSA had international representatives stationed in various parts of the world, most notably in Paris, who travelled to international student meetings and represented the NSA. In addition, the international affairs vice president of NSA did a great deal of travelling. NSA engaged in bi-lateral relations with student unions from various countries and invited student leaders to the United States to attend NSA congresses and to go on tours of college campuses. In 1956, a Foreign Student Leadership Project (FSLP) was organized which brought 15 foreign student leaders per year to the United States for several months of travel and informal visits with student leaders. The NSA engaged in its own small scale program of foreign assistance in that it provided typewriters and other aid to friendly student unions in developing countries, and thus made firm international contacts for the United States. The International Commission attempted to develop programs on American campuses which would interest students in international affairs, but these efforts were not very successful.

The International Commission led a rather independent life within the NSA. Due to its connections with FYSA, it was the best financed aspect of the NSA's program, despite the fact that it involved relatively few people and had little influence on American campuses. According to one former member of the International Commission and later an activist in the SDS, the Commission was dominated by a clique of former NSA officers who tried, with general success, to dampen conflict by appearing moderate. This observer noted that NSA overseas representatives often acted independently and did not always represent the position of the NSA congresses, and went on to point to a gap between the national and international commissions.[70] Part of the International Commission's responsibility was to prepare reports on student activities around the world for its own files. Some of these reports contained detailed information on the personalities involved in student activities in many countries.

Another of the International Commission's projects was an annual International Student Relations Seminar (ISRS). This summer-long seminar was funded by FYSA and included a dozen or more hand-picked student leaders who were groomed for posts on the international commission by the ex-NSA officers who ran the seminar. ISRS alumni played an important role at the annual NSA congresses as well, since they constituted a compact but articulate body which was able to effectively lobby for various positions. One of its members was almost inevitably elected international affairs vice president and others joined the international staff in appointed positions. All of these programs and orientations fit well into the relationship between the NSA and the CIA. The CIA was able to select reliable individuals for top NSA positions, and was also able to make use of the reports prepared by NSA personnel.

The role of the NSA in the ISC was particularly important. Not only did the NSA provide almost one-half of the ISC's budget which was collected directly from its affiliates, but the ISC's funds from the Foundation for Youth and Student Affairs inevitably came through ex-NSA staff members on the ISC secretariat, and ex-NSA staff members serving as FYSA officials. As one participant put it, "NSA played a role at ISC's far out of proportion to its single vote."[71] NSA delegations also played important roles at ISC meetings and other events. They were among the best informed on international student affairs and, because of the extensive travelling by NSA staff members, many contacts among student leaders had been developed. It is significant that the NSA had especially cordial relations with student unions from developing countries, and often sided with these groups in the ISC. There was at least one former NSA official on the ISC at all times from the beginning to the end of the organization, with the exception of the final year after the NSA-CIA disclosures, and often several Americans were stationed in Lieden. For a long period, the editor of the Student was an ex-NSA official. It is clear that the USNSA was the key to the ISC's existence in the crucial financial area, and that American NSA officers were of the utmost importance in ISC's affairs.

The NSA's international programs were critically important for the non-Communist international student organizations. Its direct activities, such as the Foreign Student Leadership Project, technical assistance to foreign student unions, scholarship programs for Angolan and Algerian refugee students, the publications of the international commission, and other activities were quite vital, but perhaps of even more importance were indirect aspects of NSA's international work--its key role in financing the ISC and its activities at ISC meetings and other international student events.

Conclusion

Student activism has become a world-wide phenomenon, and of substantial importance to governments as well as to those directly involved with higher education. Yet, activist movements and organizations are not the only elmments of the student community or even, in many countries, the most important aspect of politically conscious students. The organizations of the student community in many countries are complex and important to understand in terms of both the higher educational system and of politics. This essay has dealt with one aspect of the complex of organizations and movements dealing with students--international student organizations. Its major focus has been on two specific organizations, the International Union of Students and the International Student Conference, as key elements in the post-war student scene.

Other elements of the international student organizations are also important--regional student groups, religious and other political movements, and others, and these have received some attention here. But the main focus has been on the larger international groups.

It is clear that the student internationals do not constitute a movement. They are, rather, a complex of organizations which have attempted with varying degrees of success to work with students on the international level. These organizations have not succeeded in mobilizing large numbers of students nor in shaping events in any countries. They have not even effectively coordinated student organizations from many countries in various activities. There is little indication that the ISC and the IUS have made much headway in influencing many students--and they certainly have not touched the lives of political or other attitudes of the rank and file of students around the world.

It would seem that the impact of the ISC and IUS has been limited to influencing a few student leaders--some of whom may have gone on to become government leaders in some countries--; to providing some coordination for students activities in several areas such as travel, sports, and culture; and to publishing a range of journals and other materials whch have had a limited circulation among student leaders. The ISC never did play a critical role--this is substantiated by the lack of crisis among either students or student groups when the ISC collapsed.

The fact that the international student organizations had little part in the upsurge of student activism evident in the 1960's in both the advanced and developing countries is another indication of their failure. The IUS and ISC even had difficulties understanding the nature of the "student revolt" and made some efforts to try to cope with it. The organizations were clearly peripheral to the concerns of politically conscious students and, in fact, there is evidence that the international groups were held in low esteem by student activists in many countries.

It would also seem that the international student groups failed to provide the kind of political leadership and presence which their adult funding agencies wanted. The IUS has faithfully reflected Soviet positions on international issues and has passed many resolutions which no doubt please officials of the Soviet foreign ministry. But these resolutions have little meaning even to active members of the IUS, and in recent years have been passed only after great struggle and after some alienation of delegates. Costly programs such as the world youth festivals have yielded few discernible results. Similarly, the ISC during its existence proved that non-Communist oppostion to the IUS was possible and provided a coordinating agency for student unions which did not feel at home in the IUS. But it too failed to establish a firm basis of support among national unions of students. Blocs of students unions were willing to walk out of IUS or ISC meetings in protest against one or another policy. Seemingly firm supporters of the ISC, such as the British NUSEWNI, could disaffiliate from the organization after twenty years. In short, after two decades of active work neither of the internationals could claim a large body of committed student organizations.

The direct links between the IUS and ISC and the politics of the Cold War severely hampered their effectiveness and compromised their integrity. Indeed, given these links, it might well have been impossible for the two organizations to contribute actively to the growing student movement, since this movement has shown great spontaniety and ideological heterodoxy. Officials of both organizations were forced to hide the sources of their funds, and perhaps of their political guidance, and this must have had some effect on their own integrity and effectiveness. The mere fact that the international groups were not independent entities and could not take their own stands on international issues and student-related questions at least in part had a negative effect on the growth of the organizations. The long debates concerning "international student unity" was for the most part mere shadow boxing since neither organization could, given the nature of its outside support, merge with the other on any but its own terms.

Thus, while the student internationals were failures as movements, the international student organizations provided some services which were probably valuable to some students and student organizations. While much money was wasted, some services were performed. It is difficult to measure actively the contribution of the international student organizations--regional and specialized groups as well as the IUS and ISC--but it seems clear that the organizations never lived up to their potential and never crossed over from being an organization to being a movement.

Footnotes

1. The research reported herein was performed persuant to a grant from the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education positions or policies. The author would like to thank the Office of Education for financial support and Gail Kelly for her editorial assistance. Some of the issues discussed here also appear in Philip G. Altbach, "The International Student Movement," Journal of Contemporary History, 5 (No. 1, 1970), pp. 156-174.

2. See S. M. Lipset and P. G. Altbach, eds., Students in Revolt (Boston: Beacon Press, 1970) and Donald Emmerson, ed., Students and Politics in Developing Nations (New York: Preager, 1968) for an analysis of various national student movements.

3. A number of books by radical spokesmen have appeared which have pointed to the international importance of student movements. See particularly John and Barbara Ehrenreich, Long March, Short Spring (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1969), and Tariq Ali, ed., The New Revolutionaries: A Handbook of the International New Left, (New York: Morrow, 1969).

4. See Richard Cornell, Youth and Communism (New York: Walker, 1965), for an analysis of Communist youth movements. Non-Communist youth organizations have not received serious analytical attention.

5. Owen E. Pence, The YMCA and Social Need (New York: Association Press, 1946), p. 65.

6. A Short History of the Young Communist International, (London: Young Communist League, n.d.), p. 8.

7. Ibid., p. 6.

8. Jorgen Schleimann, "The Organization Man: The Life and Work of Willi Munzenberg," Survey, No. 55 (April, 1965), p. 68.

9. Socialist Review, 8 (December, 1919), p. 23.

10. See Jean Gallenca, "The Confederation Internationale des Etudiants," Student, 1 (June, 1957), p. 10 for a brief discussion of the CIE.

11. Gert Van Mannen, The International Student Movement: History and Background (The Hague: Interdoc, 1966), p. 37.

12. Joseph Lash, "The Geneva Youth Congress," American Socialist Monthly, 5 (October, 1936), p. 54.

13. Judah Drob, "The World Youth Congress," Socialist Review, 7 (September - October, 1938), p. 13.

14. See Frank Pinner, "Student Trade Unionism in France, Belgium and Holland," Sociology of Education, 37 (Spring, 1964), pp. 1-23.

15. Peter Jones, A History of U.S. National Student Association Relations with the International Union of Students, 1945-56 (Philadelphia: Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania, 1956), p. 4.

16. Paul F. Magnelia, The International Union of Students, (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, School of International Studies, University of Geneva, 1967), p. 21. See also Gert Van Mannen, op. cit., pp. 37-50.

17. Peter Jones, op. cit., p. 7.

18. According to Magnelia, only two of the seven key individuals in the IUS secretariat were not Communists. Paul Magnelia, op. cit., p. 81.

19. All non-Communist analyses of the early period of the IUS reflect this view. See Magnelia, op. cit., Van Mannen, op. cit., and Jones, op. cit. It should be noted that all of these accounts are highly critical of the IUS in general.

20. Gert Van Mannen, op. cit., p. 55.

21. Peter Jones, op. cit., p. 44.

22. Paul Magnelia, op. cit., p. 142.

23. Ibid., pp. 114-118. See also Ruth McVey, The Calcutta Conference and the Southeast Asian Uprisings (Ithaca, N.Y. Modern Indonesia Project, Cornell University, 1958).

24. Gert Van Mannen, op. cit., p. 78.

25. "Stormy IUS Congress at Prague," Times Educational Supplement (September 1, 1950), p. 676.

26. Jean Gallenca, op. cit., p. 10.

27. These figures, and later estimates of ISC financial activities, are taken from financial statements of the International Student Conference.

28. Sol Stern, "CIA:NSA: A Short Account of International Student Politics and the Cold War," Ramparts, 5 (March, 1967), pp. 29-39.

29. Alexander Korns, A History of the International Student Conference, 1950-1960, Senior Honors Thesis, Harvard University, 1962, p. 37.

30. Miroslav Chmelik, "Some Questions on the International Sports Movement and the Universiade in Tokyo," World Student News, 21 (No. 9-10, 1967), pp. 28-31.

31. See George Hazilrigg, "Report on Student Situation in India, December, 1963," (mimeographed paper, International Student Relations Seminar).

32. Bill Savage, "The 7th Congress of the International Union of Students," Student, 6 (October, 1962), p. 23.

33. "Festival Financing," Youth and Freedom, 5 (No. 4, 1962), p. 6.

34. Bill Savage, op. cit., p. 23.

35. Peter Jones, op. cit., p. 99.

36. It is not possible here to detail the relationship between the CIA and international organizations. The original links were provided by Ramparts magazine in their own famous story. See Sol Stern, op. cit. See also, "The CIA and the Students," Time, 89 (February 24, 1967).

37. Report of the Investigation Commission Concerning Recent Charges Against the International Student Conference (Leiden: International Student Conference, 1967), p. 47. This document provides some important documentation concerning this topic although its conclusions are, not surprisingly, not completely frank.

38. Report of the Investigation Commission..., op. cit., p. A23. See also Robert Walters, "CIA Gave Millions to Additional World Youth Units," Washington Evening Star, (February 14, 1967), p.1 ff, and "America's Hidden Government: The CIA and the Student World," World Student News, 21 (No. 3-7, 1967), pp. 1-14.

39. Saadati Babek, "From Peking to Peru," World Student News, 13 (June and July, 1959), pp. 18-22 and 14-19.

40. Alexander Korns, op. cit., p. 37.

41. Ibid., p. 27.

42. There is a good deal of documentation concerning the Sino-Soviet dispute and the international student movement. See Frank Griffiths, Sino Soviet Conflict at the 7th IUS Congress (Ottowa: National Federation of Canadian University Students, 1962), Frank Griffiths, World Student Unity and the Sino-Soviet Split (Ottowa:

Canadian Union of Students, 1964), Philip Altbach and Gail Paradise, "Student Politics and World Politics" Our Generation Against Nuclear War, 3 (October, 1964), pp. 89-95, The Youth Fronts, 1946-66, (New York: Institute for International Youth Affairs, 1966), pp. 17-22.

43. Zbynek Vokrouhilcky, "A Few Thoughts on a Big Event: The Ninth Congress of the IUS," World Student News, 21 (No. 5-6, 1967), pp. 2-7. See also "The IUS: Ulan Bator and Beyond," Student, 12 (September-October, 1967), pp. 16-19.

44. Alexander Korns, op. cit., p. 37.

45. Ibid., p. 61.

46. Saadati Babek, op. cit., pp. 18-22.

47. See The International Student Movement: Past, Present, Future (Leiden: International Student Conference, n.d.) for the documents of the Leysin, Switzerland seminar.

48. See "Tenth International Student Conference," Student, 6 (September, 1962), pp. 2-11 for a description of the conference in Quebec.

49. See Mailand Christensen, "The Prospects for World Student Unity." Student, 6 (November, 1962), p. 7.

50. For a dissenting view of the 11th ISC, see Mike Steadman, "The 11th International Student Conference," World Student News, 18 (No. 7-8, 1964), pp. 2-5 ff.

51. Monthly Reports (Institute for International Youth Affairs) (August, 1966), p. 15.

52. Wlodzmierz Koarski, "12th International Student Conference: The Rotary Club," World Student News, 20 (NO. 7-8-9, 1966), p. 25.

53. For a favorable picture of the Nairobi ISC, see "Nairobi, 1966," Student, 10 (September, 1966), pp. 4-9.

54. See Report of the Investigation Commission..., op. cit.

55. "Festival Financing," Youth and Freedom, 5 (No. 4, 1962), p. 6.

56. For discussions of the World Youth Festivals, see "8th World Festival of Youth and Students," Youth and Freedom, 5 (No. 4, 1962), pp. 1-35; Courtship of Young Minds: A Case Study of the Moscow Youth Festival, (New York: East European Student and Youth Service, 1959); Report on the Vienna Youth Festival, (New York: Independent Research Service, 1960). These analyses are informative although hostile to the organizers. Favorable accounts can be found in various issues of World Student News and World Youth, the publication of the World Federation of Democratic Youth, Budapest.

57. It is significant that an American private organization, later linked to the CIA, the Independent Research Service, provided funds for non-Communist American young people to attend several festivals and was instrumental in organizing opposition to the Communist festival officials at the Vienna and Helsinki events.

58. Monthly Reports (Institute for International Youth Affairs) (July-August, 1968), p. 50.

59. For reports on the World Youth Forums, see The World Youth Forum and the Meeting of Its International Committee, September 15-17 (1960), (New York: Independent Research Service, 1960) and Philip G. Altbach, "Youth Meets in Moscow," Problems of Communism, 6 (November-December, 1964), pp. 64-67.

60. See Tariq Ali, ed., op. cit. See also, Daniel and Gabriel Cohn-Bendit, Obsolete Communism: A Left Wing Alternative, (London: Andre Deutsch, 1968) for a good exposition of the internationalist vision of the European new left.

61. The following English language journals are taken seriously by new left intellectuals in a number of countries: New Left Review (England), International Socialist Journal (Italy), Our Generation (Canada), and Leviathan (US).

62. Factional bifurcation and subsequent weakening of student movements is evident in a number of countries. The American SDS in 1969 split into at least three separate factions and then lost much of its support. Similar events occured in the German SDS, and as a result the student movement was weakened although many activists have left the campus. The Japanese Zengakuren is divided into at least a dozen factions and no longer constitutes an effective political movement.

63. John Clews, Students Unite: The IUS and Its Work, (Paris: Congress for Cultural Freedom, 1952), p. 15.

64. Richard Walter, Student Politics in Argentina: The University Reform and Its Effects, 1918-1964, (New York: Basic Books, 1968), p. 179.

65. Carlos Gonzalez, "The Fourth Latin American Student Cnngress," Student, 5 (December, 1961), pp. 4-9ff.

66. The best analysis of the West African Students Union can be found in Philip Garigue, "The West African Students' Union: A Study in Culture Contact," Africa, 23 (Januyar, 1953), pp. 55-69.

67. For a discussion of the early international aspects of the NSA, see Martin McLaughlin, Political Processes in American National Student Organizations, (South Bend, Indiana: Notre Dame University, 1948). For a more general discussion of the early period of the NSA,

see Barry Keating, A History of the Student Government Movement in America, (New York: Students for Democratic Action, 1953, mimeo.) See also Peter Jones, op. cit.

68. See Sol Stern, op. cit., for further data on this subject.

69. Barry Keating, op. cit., p. 4.

70. Bob Ross, The United States National Student Association: A Policy Critique, (mimeographed document distributed at the 1963 NSA Congress), p. 2.

71. Alexander Korns, op. cit., p. 62.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Apeland, Nils, World Youth and the Communists, London: Phoenix House, 1958

Annales de la RIC, 1959-1960, Leiden: Coordinating Secretariat of International Unions of Students, 1961

Background of the 9th World Youth Festival New York: Independent Research Service, 1965

Blumenau, Ralph, Communists and Students, London: Batchworth Press, 1954

Boitel, Henry J., International Student Cooperation, Philadelphia: U.S. National Student Association, 1962

Britain's Students in Today's World: The Report of the International Commission, London: National Union of Students, 1965

The Communist Youth International; Report of Activity Between the 4th and 5th Congress, 1928-9, New York: Young Workers League, 1928

Clews, John, Students Unite: The I.U.S. and Its Work, Paris: Congress for Cultural Freedom, 1952

Cornell, Richard, Youth and Communism, New York: Walker, 1965

Dall, Hans, The Logical Development of the Student Movement, Leiden: International Student Conference, 1963

Green, Gil, United We Stand for Peace and Socialism (Report on the 6th World Congress of the Young Communist International.), New York: Workers Library Publishers, 1935

Griffiths, Frank, Sino-Soviet Conflict at the 7th I.U.S. Congress, Ottawa: National Federation of Canadian University Students, 1962

Griffiths, Frank, World Student Unity and the Sino-Soviet Split, Ottawa: Canadian Union of Students, 1964

International Student Affairs, Washington, D.C.: U.S. National Student Association, 1965

The International Student Movement, Leiden: Coordinating Secretariat of National Unions of Students, 1963

McVey, Ruth T., The Calcutta Conference and the Southeast Asian Uprisings, Ithaca, NY: Modern Indonesia Project, Cornell University, 1958

Orth, Robert, International Communist Front Organizations, Pfaffenhofen: Ilmgau Verlag, 1964

Pence, Owen E., The YMCA and Social Need, New York: Association Press, 1946

Quebec, 1962: The Story of the Tenth International Student Conference, Leiden: COSEC, 1962

Report of the International Student Delegation to Africa, Leiden: International Student Conference, n.d.

Report of the Investigation Commission Concerning Recent Charges Against the International Student Conference, Leiden: International Student Conference, 1967

Report of the I.U.S. Delegation to the 6th I.S.C., Prague: International Union of Students, 1957

Report on the Vienna Youth Festival, New York: Independent Research Service, 1960

Romerstein, Herbert, The Communist International Youth and Student Apparatus, Washington, D. C.: U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, 1963

Rote Jugendfahnen Über Wien (Report on the 2nd International Socialist Youth Congress.), Vienna: Socialistischer Jugendverlag, 1929

Sabharwal, Pran, Asian African Students Conference, Bandung, 1956. Little Bandung; A Report on Asian African Students Conference (May-June, 1956), Delhi: University Press, 1956

Sabharwal, Pran, Student Action Against Oppression: The First Fifteen Years of the ISC, Leiden: International Student Conference, 1966

A Short History of the Young Communist International, London: Young Communist League, n.d.

Students in Search of Their University, Paris: International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation, 1939

Van Maanen, Gert, The International Student Movement, The Hague: Interdoc, 1966

World Student Relief, 1940-1950, Geneva: World University Service, 1951

The Youth Fronts, 1946-1966, New York: Institute for International Youth Affairs, 1966

ARTICLES

"Afro-Asian Youth Conference: A Case Against the West", Youth and Communism, 2 (March 1959), 19-20

"All Africa Students' Conference", West Africa, 44 (October 15, 1960), 1181

Altbach, Philip G., "The International Student Movement," Comparative Education Review, 8 (October, 1964), 131-137

Altbach, Philip G., "The International Student Movement" Journal of Contemporary History, 5 (January, 1970), 87-104

Altbach, Philip G., "Youth Meets in Moscow" Problems of Communism, 8 (November-December, 1964), 64-67

Altbach, Philip and Gail Paradise, "Student Politics and World Politics" Our Generation Against Nuclear War, 3 (October, 1964), 89-95

"America's Hidden Government: The CIA and the Student World" World Student News, 21 (No. 3-4, 1967), 1-14

"Anti-Colonial Front for Students" Economist, 180 (September 8, 1956), 801

Avila, Raul, Ram Lakhina, and Ronald Story, "The Growing Conflict in the I.U.S." Student, 9 (January 1965), 4-9

Babek, Saadati, "From Peking to Peru" World Student News, 13 (June and July, 1959), 18-22 and 14-19

Bashir, Hassan, "Will the ISC Recover?" World Student News, 16 (No. 7-8, 1962) 3-6 ff

Burgoyne, Susan, "The World Youth Festival" Australian Left Review, (February-March 1969), 45-49

Chmelik, Miroslav, "Some Questions on the International Sports Movement and the Universiade in Tokyo" World Student News, 21 (No. 9-10, 1967), 28-31

Christensen, T. Mailand, "The Past and Present of the International Student Conference" Student, 8 (No. 2-3, 1964), 7-10

Christensen, T. Mailand, "The Prospects for World Student Unity" Student, 6 (November, 1962), 5-12

"The CIA and the Students" Time, 89 (February 24, 1967), 14ff

Clews, John, "Communism's 'Fourth Lever': The Youth and Student Fronts" Problems of Communism, 5 (November-December, 1956), 39-45

"The Coordinating Secretariat Ten Years Later" Student, 6 (January, 1962),

Cornell, Richard, "Youthful Radicalism and the Formation of Communist Youth Organizations: A Historical Precedent" in S.M. Lipset and P.G. Altbach, eds., Students in Revolt, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969, 475-494

Delaney, J.V., "World Students Organize for Freedom" America, 92 (October 2, 1954), 11-13

Diab, Anwar, "Exploration of the Problems of World Student Unity" Student, 7 (May, 1963), 5-11

Diez, Rodrigo, "International Congress of Students Meeting 1921" Bulletin of the Pan American Union, 53 (December, 1921), 546-555

Drob, Judah, "The World Youth Congress" Socialist Review, 7 (September-October, 1938), 13-16

"Eighth Congress of the International Union of Students" World Student News, 18 (No. 11-12, 1964), 1-10

"The 8th World Youth Festival" Youth and Freedom, 5 (No. 4, 1962), 1-32

Ekmanis, Rolf, "Disenchantment in Helsinki Festival of Youth and Students" Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R. Bulletin, 29 (November, 1963), 17-27

"The 11th International Student Conference" Youth and Freedom, 6 (No. 5, 1964), 1-6

"Focus on the 7th I.U.S. Congress" World Student News, 16 (No. 9-10, 1962) 2-16

"14th International Student Seminar" Student, 7 (October, 1963), 10-24

Garigue, Philip, "The West African Students' Union: A Study in Culture Contact" Africa, 23 (January, 1953), 55-69

Gallenca, Jean, "The Confederation Internationale des Etudiants" Student, 1 (June, 1957), p. 10

Gerin, Jaques, "The Regrettable Rejections: A Point of View on the Round Table on World Student Unity" Student, 4 (August, 1960), 28-31

Gonzales, Carlos, "The Fourth Latin American Student Congress" Student, 5 (December, 1961), 4-9ff

Hunt, R.H. Carew, "Willi Muenzenberg" in David Footman, ed., International Communism, Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1960, 72-87

"The International Student Conference: Six Years of the Free Student Movement", World Today, 12 (September, 1956), 371-378

"An International Students' Conference at Birmingham", West Africa, 21 (January 16, 1937), 13-14

"The International Youth Movement", Youth and Freedom, 5 (No. 3, 1962), 1-8

"The IUS: Ulan Bator and Beyond", Student, 12 (September-October, 1967), 16-19

Konarski, Wlodzimierz, "12th International Student Conference: The Rotary Club", World Student News, 20 (No. 7-8-9, 1966), 24-31

Lakhina, Ram, "The Future Direction of the ISC", International Student Bulletin, 1 (May, 1968), 3-6

Lash, Joseph P., "The Geneva Youth Congress", American Socialist Monthly, 5 (October, 1936), 54-56

MacCracken, J.H., "Twelfth Annual Conference of International Student Service", Eucational Record, 14 (October, 1933), 507-515

McDowell, Arthur, "The Socialist Youth Movement", American Socialist Quarterly, 3 (Summer, 1934), 37-42

"Meeting, 1955, Birmingham University", Economist, 176 (July 23, 1955), 321-322

Morris, Bernard S., "Communist International Front Organizations", World Politics, 9 (October, 1956), 76-87

Munger, Edwin S., "First Pan African Student Conference", American University Field Staff East Africa Series, 4 (July 7, 1958)

"Nairobi, 1966", Student, 10 (September, 1966), 4-9

Nath, Dwarka, "The 9th ISC and the 'Two Bloc' Concept", Student, 4 (November, 1960), 6-10

Obe, Emmanuel, "Unity in Diversity: The 7th ISC", Student, 3 (Mid-November, 1957), 8-11

Parsons, J.S., "Students in Conflict", School of Advanced Inernational Studies Review, 10 (Winter, 1966), 20-26

Pelikan, Jiri, "What Helps and Hinders Cooperation: A Reply to the Student", World Student News, 17 (No. 2-3, 1963), 15-23

Robson, George, "The International Student Conference at Liverpool", Student World, 1 (April, 1908), 41-44

Savage, Bill, "The 7th Congress of the International Union of Students", Student, 6 (October, 1962), 18-24

Schechter, Dan, Michael Ansara, and David Kolodney, "The CIA is an Equal Opportunity Employer", Ramparts, 7 (June, 1969), 25-33

Schleimann, Jorgen, "The Organization Man: The Life and Work of Willi Munzenberg", Survey, No. 55 (April, 1965), 64-91

"Second Moscow World Youth Forum", Youth and Freedom, 6 (No. 6, 1964), 1-8

"The 7th I.U.S. Congress", World Student News, 16 (No. 9-10, 1962), 2-16

Sigmund, Paul E., "Helsinki: The Last Youth Festival?", Problems of Communism, 11 (September-October, 1962), 58-62

Singh, Jyoti Shankar, "Fresh Look at the Bases of Cooperation", Student, 6 (June, 1962), 16-19

Singh, Jyoti Shankar, "The 12th International Student Conference: A New Opportunity for Student Action", Student, 8 (April, 1964), 2-5

Sklar, Robert, "Student Politicians at Dubrovnik", Universities Quarterly, 18 (December, 1963), 44-51

"Special Section on the 9th ISC", Student, 4 (October, 1960), 6-17

Steadman, Mike, "The 11th International Student Conference", World Student News, 18 (No. 7-8, 1964), 2-5ff

Steiger, Martin, "Soviet Policy Regarding World Youth", Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R. Bulletin, 8 (March 1961), 22-28

Stern, Sol, "CIA: NSA: A Short Account of International Student Politics and the Cold War", Ramparts, 5 (March, 1967), 29-39

Tanaka, Yuzo, "Three Questions about the Seventh ISC", World Student News, 11 (No. 12, 1957), 18-20

"Tenth International Student Conference", Student, 6 (September, 1962), 2-11

Trevelyan, Mary, "The African in the International Student Community", African Affairs, 62 (July, 1963), 258-261

"Trois Congres d'etudiants", Presence Africain, 36 (1st Trimester 1961), 148-152

Triesman, David, "The CIA and Student Politics" in A. Cockburn and R. Blackburn, eds., Student Power, Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1969, 141-162

"Troubled International Fronts", Youth and Freedom, 6 (No. 1-2, 1963), 1-8

Tyler, Gus, "The International Socialist Youth Movement", American Socialist Quarterly, 2 (Winter 1933), 49-57

Vokrouhilcky, Zbynek, "A Few Thoughts on a Big Event: The Nineth Congress of the IUS", World Student News, 21 (No. 5-6, 1967), 2-7

"WAY"s History", WAYForum, No. 29 (August, 1958), 3-17

"World Congress of Students", Bulletin of the International Bureau of Education, 77 (4th Quarter 1945), 127

"The World Youth Forum: Disseminating a Certain Political Ideology . . .", Youth and Freedom, 4 (No. 3-4, 1961), 1-10

DISSERTATIONS AND OTHER MIMEOGRAPHED MATERIAL

Copplestone Frank, A Study of International Student Relations, 1945-1947, Philadelphia: U.S. National Student Association, 1957

Cornell, Richard, The Origins and Development of the Communist Youth International, 1914-1924, Unpublished PhD dissertation, Columbia University, 1965

Jones, Peter, A History of U.S. National Student Association Relations with the International Union of Students, 1945-56, Philadelphia: Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania, 1956

Keating, Barry, A History of the Student Government Movement in America, New York: Students for Democratic Action , Middle Atlantic Region, 1953 (mimeographed)

Magnelia, Paul F., The International Union of Students, Menlo Park, California: Peninsula Lithograph, 1966

McLaughlin, Martin M., Political Processes in American National Student Organizations, PhD Dissertation, Notre Dame University, Department of Political Science, 1948

Ross, Bob, The United States National Student Association: A Policy Critique, Mimeographed document distributed to the 1963 NSA Congress

Young, Crawford, The IUS: Hungary and Beyond (working paper for the 9th International Student Relations Seminar), Philadelphia: U.S. National Student Association, 1961 (mimeographed)

Korns, Alexander, A History of the International Student Conference, 1950-1960, Senior Honors Thesis, Harvard University, 1962.